

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

09 March 1999

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

Members: M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, J. Legendre, A. Munter,
W. Stewart and R. van den Ham

Regrets: D. Beamish

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 23 February 1999.

CARRIED

REGULAR ITEMS -PLANNING ITEM

1. LAND ACQUISITION - MARLBOROUGH FOREST, RIDEAU
-Planning and Development Approvals' Commissioner report dated 22 January 1999

That Planning and Environment Committee approve the following action:

1. **Recommend to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee the acquisition of 200 acres, described as being the south part of Lots 24 & 25, Concession 3, former Township of Marlborough, now Township of Rideau from**

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 14 April 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 28.

Martha Marie Marleau and the Estate of Edley Burton as an addition to the Marlborough Forest for a consideration of \$60,245;

- 2. Planning and Development Approvals Department make application to the Ministry of Natural Resources to approve the addition of these lands to the Marlborough Forest Management Agreement;**
- 3. Upon receipt of approval of the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Marlborough Forest addition be brought to Council for confirmation and a by-law adding the land to the Management Agreement be submitted for adoption.**

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

2. LEACHATE MANAGEMENT - CONSULTATION RESULTS ON THE LEACHATE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OPTIONS

- Acting Deputy Commissioner Environment and Transportation Department report dated 22 February 1999

Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division and Jim Miller Director, Engineering Division, Environment and Transportation Department, appeared before the Committee and made a presentation on the staff report.

The Committee then heard from the following delegations.

Joe King, Barrhaven Sewer Action Committee, (BSAC) pointed out the staff report indicated the BSAC's position is "no pipeline through Barrhaven", while in fact BSAC has made it very clear their position is no pipeline at all, on-site treatment is preferred. The speaker outlined BSAC's four main concerns, namely, 1. The long term environmental impact of shipping leachate through to the R.O. Pickard Environmental Centre; 2. The possibility of an environmental catastrophe of a future rupture of cells one or two at the Trail Road Landfill Site; 3. What is required now and by whom; and, 4. What will happen if the Region amends the Official Plan.

Mr. King went on to outline his committee's concerns about the number and quantities of contaminants, including a number of known carcinogens, present in the leachate from Trail Road that pass through the R.O. Pickard Centre down the river. Mr. King opined the R.O. Pickard Centre does not treat everything and of particular concern to BSAC is that

95 to 100% of chemicals such as chlorine, arsenic, selenium, bromomethane and styrene go through R.O. Pickard virtually untreated. As well, 50 to 95% of heavy metals such as boron, cobalt, molybdenen, nickel and phenol, and 25 to 50% of other contaminants such as lead and zinc also pass through the plant virtually untreated.

Mr. King then addressed BSAC's concern about the impact of a rupture of cells one or two and the environmental implications this would have. He noted the caps on sites one and two are made of high density polyethylene and have been put there to stop the contaminants in the water from getting into the top of the landfill. However, large craters are being created by the vacuum (caused by the leachate) and these caps are being stretched. Mr. King expressed fear the membranes will crack as they are being stretched and if this happens, it will be a major environmental catastrophe.

In Mr. King's opinion, staff knew leachate would have to be removed from cell three, as leachate had been building up for the last five years. He said with good management , there would be no increase in the amount of leachate being shipped out annually until 2004. As well, the Ministry of Environment (MOE) has required removal of contaminated groundwater from the landfill for at least 5 years; their concern is not with the leachate.

In closing, Mr. King warned if the Region proceeds to amend the Official Plan, the BSAC would appeal it to the Ontario Municipal Board. The environment is a priority for residents of the Region and a constructed wetland would be the most environmentally friendly and sustainable option.

Committee Chair Hunter inquired about the presence of minerals and heavy metals in the leachate and how a constructed wetland would help dissipate these. Mr. King indicated there are a number of plants and invertebrates that would utilize these metals; he gave the example of tomatoes that require chlorides to turn red.

Referring to points raised by the delegation, Councillor Legendre asked staff to comment on the issue of amending the Regional Official Plan (ROP). Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law indicated there would be a need to amend the ROP if the pipeline is extended as this would have to be reflected in the ROP. However, if on-site treatment were the chosen alternative, no amendment would be required.

The Councillor went on to inquire about the craters on sites one and two. Mr. McNally advised as waste decomposes, there is some "giving away" and depressions are caused. He indicated the Department monitors the integrity of all of the caps on a regular basis. Councillor Legendre then asked what would happen if the film did break. Mr. McNally replied if there is a failure of the cap, there would be more rainwater or snow getting into the garbage mass, extending the generation of leachate or contaminated groundwater on

the site. In addition to the monitoring of the caps, there is on going monitoring of the entire site, including those portions that are closed.

Mr. McNally confirmed for Councillor Legendre that cells one and two do not have an artificial liner. He said these two cells are functioning as they were designed to, as a natural attenuation process, which was completely appropriate at the time those cells were developed. The Region owns property to the north (as this is the direction groundwater flows) and staff monitor the groundwater flow in this area. Mr. McNally also indicated the groundwater is moving at a slow enough pace that if there is ever a problem, there would be ample opportunity to put in some type of collection mechanism (e.g. a collector trench around the perimeter of the site to intercept the contaminated groundwater) or purchase additional land if this option is deemed reasonable.

Responding to questions posed by Councillor Munter, Nancy Schepers, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, advised staff apply the same measurement criteria and premiums to the Trail Road leachate as they would to any discharge to the sewer system. She said there are a number of parameters within the leachate that are treatable at the R.O. Pickard Centre and are presently being paid for and would continue to be paid for. Ms. Schepers went on to note the Sewer Use By-law sets out that the receipt of any leachate within the sewer system or at the plant requires Council approval. She estimated there would be less than 25 Compliance Agreements for industries that exceed parameters in the Sewer Use By-law (wherein industries are given a specific amount of time to comply with the Sewer Use By-law), in addition to Discharge Agreements, which covers parameters that are treatable at the plant.

Councillor Munter asked if the list shown by Mr. King with respect to the contaminants in the leachate from Trail Road was correct. Mr. McNally advised that Mr. King's information was derived from the consultants report, however, he pointed out that what was not shown by Mr. King was the levels of contaminants in the leachate, with respect to the discharge.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked staff if there was sufficient land at the landfill site to develop a constructed wetland to treat the groundwater contamination from the Nepean Landfill site. Mr. McNally noted in the 1996 Buffer Land Assessment Report, a preliminary design was done and based on preliminary engineering, there was sufficient land for a constructed wetland.

Councillor Stewart noted the delegation advised a cap failure would result in a major environmental disaster and she asked staff if this was a possibility. Mr. McNally said in light of the ongoing monitoring program that is carried out, there is no possibility of an environmental disaster; if the cap failed, staff would catch this very quickly. The Councillor then asked if the Region would accept this discharge if it were not its owns.

Ms. Schepers reiterated the Region treats this discharge no differently than any other industrial discharge.

In a closing comment, Mr. King stated although BSAC believes Trail Road Landfill Site is being well managed currently, they feel that action should be taken on the optimization/remediation of the landfill, sooner rather than later because of a possible failure of the caps.

Roger Pyper and Werner Daeschel, appeared before the Committee on behalf of the Citizens Review Committee (CRC). Mr. Pyper referenced a number of areas of the Executive Summary of the RMOC Trail Road Landfill Leachate Treatment and Disposal Options report and questioned why, the recommended option states “.....Treatment and Disposal of both the leachate from the Trail Road Waste Facility and contaminated ground and surface water from the Nepean Bufferlands at the ROPEC”, when the costs set out in the report are only for the leachate of the Trail Road facility. A copy of Mr. Pyper’s submission is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Mr. Daeschel provided members of the Committee with a copy of his submission (held on file with the Regional Clerk). He said the Committee was being asked to approve a proposal to send highly contaminated leachate, down a fragile sewer pipe into the existing sewer system, to a sewer plant incapable of processing the leachate and this would result in contamination of the Ottawa River. Mr. Daeschel said there are a number of jurisdictions in the United States and Europe that do not allow processing of leachate in sewer plants. He drew the Committee’s attention to his submission which outlines the proportions and parameters of a number of contaminants contained in the leachate.

Mr. Daeschel referred to a letter from the CRC to the members of the Committee. He noted the recommendations contained therein are that tandem wetlands be the on-site treatment for the leachate and for the groundwater. These methods provide environmentally sound paradigms for processing the Nepean site contaminated ground flow and leachate, without all of the problems outlined above.

Councillor Munter, noted the speaker indicated in his letter, the Gore & Storrie report identifies the constructed wetlands at a lower cost than forcemain conveyance and he asked staff to comment on this. Mr. McNally advised in the analysis carried out by the consultant, cost was only one aspect, there were a number of other criteria. Mr. Miller added, in reference to Section 5.9 of the report, the capital cost of the pipeline was the lowest cost when analysed. He suggested the delegation was comparing the wetland cost to a pipeline option, which is no longer on the table. Mr. Daeschel stated his information was based on the report and represented both operating and capital costs.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked staff to respond to the question posed by Mr. Pyper. Mr. Miller advised staff approached this issue by first looking at the leachate, which is the higher strength waste; the contaminated groundwater was added in after, and this resulted in only slightly increased operating costs.

Councillor Legendre said he was trying to understand the problem the delegations had with the pipeline because once it is place, the Councillor saw the issue as “benign”. At Mr. Daechsel’s request, Mr. King responded to this question. He referred to a document put out by the Phillips Corporation, the company that makes the material that staff are proposing be used for the pipeline. This document sets out problems with the material before they even start to degrade the material. As well, this technique has never been used in Ontario for shipping leachate and this concerns the BSAC. Councillor Legendre asked staff if they had looked at the report referred to by Mr. King. Mr. Miller said they had not but would be pleased to do so.

Jan Harder, Councillor, City of Nepean; Rick Hobart, Chair, City of Nepean Environmental Advisory Committee; and, Terry McIntyre, Vice Chair, City of Nepean Environmental Advisory Committee A copy of the report submitted by Councillor Margaret Rywak, Chair, City of Nepean Public Works Committee was provided to all members of Council and is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Ms. Harder thanked staff and Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen for their work on this issue. She went on to state she believed the Trail Road Landfill Site was well managed. The speaker drew the Committee’s attention to the City of Nepean Public Works Committee report and the motion which she had brought forward. She noted the rural residents in the area would like to have the leachate managed as quickly as possible and their choice would be the pipeline routed down Cambrian Road. Ms. Harder noted in the last 12 to 18 months, new technology has developed for on-site management. She said although she did not believe the situation could be handled totally with on-site management (i.e. trucking could not be canceled out), she would like to see an on-site biology based pilot project undertaken to treat the leachate and contaminated groundwater.

Mr. Hobart stated the Nepean Environmental Advisory Committee (NEAC) had reviewed the report and provided advice to the Nepean Public Works Committee. He said the NEAC accepted the preferred option is the pipeline, and noted pipelines are commonly used throughout North America. As well, he said the NEAC took into consideration the fact that many of the on-site management options would result in discharge to the Jock River, which would not likely be approved by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE).

Mr. McIntyre then provided the Committee with an overview of the report submitted by the Environmental Advisory Committee on new on-site technologies.

Councillor Legendre suggested the presentation by Mr. McIntyre was at odds with the position expressed by Mr. Hobart. Ms. Harder explained the Public Works Committee gave direction to the Environmental Advisory Committee to assess the Region's recommendation and to look at what else could be done. As a result, Dr. McIntyre put together the background material on emerging technologies for on-site treatment. Mr. Hobart added that by having the pipeline and a pilot project, this would be "the best of both worlds" and as well, a pilot project would allow these new technologies to be tested and proved out. Dr. McIntyre added the two recommendations were in fact complimentary; he said the point they were trying to make was that the new technologies should not be excluded from consideration.

Councillor Legendre said he had the impression the Region must move soon to solve the problem created by leachate; he asked staff to comment. Mr. McNally responded the leachate is currently being trucked and can continue to be trucked. However, with respect to the contaminated groundwater, staff want to get on with remediation. He noted the original recommendation for the groundwater was a wetland solution, however, in looking for a better long term solution to trucking the leachate the pipeline option evolved. This represents an opportunity to solve both the leachate and Nepean situation at the same time. Mr. McNally advised a biological treatment could take a number of years to arrive at a solution for the leachate. He referenced Essex-Windsor which has put in place an aquatic filtration system as a three year pilot project and in their 1998 annual report in their best month they were only able to treat at a rate of 25% of the design flow.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. McNally pointed out the Environment and Transportation Department continue to look at innovative new ways to deal with things. He said, subject to budget limitations, it would not be inconceivable to proceed with both the pipeline and a pilot project. Ms. Schepers added the Department is very consistent in keeping current of emerging technologies and in these instances they have looked for partnerships.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen thanked the delegations and asked if they were aware of any programs that may be available through the Ministry of the Environment. Dr. McIntyre replied the National Research Council has successfully matched the people who have the technology with the people who have the funds to support the technology with the people who have the requisite sites. He said he would be pleased to provide the Region with more specific direction on how this could be done.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen commented that in her research on this issue, she learned that in Europe and in Japan, landfilling is not an acceptable way to manage garbage. She suggested perhaps the consideration of the treatment of leachate should be deferred to be considered in conjunction with the optimization report which will be considered by Committee later in the spring.

Mrs. Sinha, submitted a written copy of her presentation, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk. The main points of Mrs. Sinha's submission were as follows: Trail Road is not and has never been a suitable site for a landfill (it sits on sand and gravel, is 1/4 mile from the Jock River and is within a flood plain); on-site treatment would not be a viable alternative given the arctic winter weather experienced in Ottawa; the pipeline is the only viable alternative; the Trail Road site should be closed and other alternatives (e.g. explore alternate sites in rural areas of the Region; incineration or trucking of garbage to abandoned mines in Quebec). Due to the length of Mrs. Sinha's presentation, Committee Chair Hunter asked the speaker to summarize her comments. Mrs. Sinha expressed great displeasure at being interrupted and asked that the minutes reflect the fact the Committee would not grant her additional time. Councillor Munter suggested Mrs. Sinha's written submission be given to the Committee Coordinator for distribution to all members of the Committee.

Lois K. Smith stated she has long had an interest in treating waste material in the most benign and least costly manner possible. She felt that consideration should be given to cost on both a long and short term basis, as well as to both monetary and biological costs. Miss Smith referred to research done around the world, many years previous, which found that sludge contaminated with heavy metals and other things, could no longer be used for farm practices. She said this was her concern about the heavy metals in the leachate going to the R.O. Pickard Centre and she questioned what would be done with the sludge at that point. She cautioned the Region could, at some point, find it too costly (both biologically and monetarily) to deal with this sludge. Miss Smith stated, for these reasons, she would recommend that as much as possible be pre-treated at the Trail Road site, using a biological method, and that a pipeline (with censors) be constructed to convey the leachate (as it is a safer method of conveyance than trucking) but that the pipeline be located away from residential areas.

Steve Burns, District Manager, Ministry of the Environment advised the Ministry had reviewed the original evaluation report (Trail Road Landfill Site Treatment and Disposal Options) and concurred the evaluation was appropriate and thorough. He said it met the MOE's requirements and they agree that piping the leachate and contaminated groundwater to the R.O. Pickard Centre is the preferred alternative. Mr. Burns said it was appropriate to select the treatment technology but not the route, as further technical studies and public consultation are needed with respect to pipeline routing and infrastructure design.

Mr. Burns went on to say for the Ministry there are two issues; the first is ensuring the landfill leachate is properly managed to avoid operational and environmental problems in the future and the second issue is the groundwater contamination from the closed Nepean site. He noted the newer portions of the landfill were designed with the idea of disposing

of collected leachate and this is currently being trucked. The speaker said there has been one accident with a tanker and this is not a bad safety record. With respect to the ground water contamination from the closed site, the MOE was in agreement with the Region's three phase plan to deal with this (i.e. capping the old site, monitoring and acquisition of property, and treatment of the contaminated groundwater). The plans called for the treatment issue to be addressed this year.

The speaker stated most on site treatment would require discharge to the Jock River, which is a very sensitive receiver and is already degraded in water quality. The MOE ensures that any discharge to that receiver is treated to a very high degree. Mr. Burns pointed out the solution recommended recognizes the Region already has an asset (the R.O. Pickard Centre) and suggests that it be utilized. The co-treatment of leachate and municipal sewage is a common and proven method to treat leachate it is used throughout Ontario and Canada. The recommended solution also has the added benefit of treating both the leachate and the contaminated groundwater and provides the opportunity to treat any further contaminated groundwater. With respect to emerging technologies, Mr. Burns said they should be encouraged and supported but they must be looked at in terms of the specific site and evaluated carefully.

In closing, Mr. Burns recognized the Region has worked diligently to address the MOE's concerns about the groundwater contamination at the Nepean site and their concerns about ongoing the operation of the Trail Road facility. He said the MOE would like to see the Region move forward in resolving these issues.

Vickie Mason stated she took exception to the comments made by the MOE representative. She noted in 1975, on behalf of her community association, she spoke at the environment hearings and urged them not to locate the landfill at this site, which was a sand and gravel pit. She said the MOE kept giving the landfill conditional Certificates of Approval without monitoring the site.

Ms. Mason went on to say that all of Nepean and in fact the Region are stakeholders in this, not just Barrhaven and she felt the rest of the Region had been left out of the process. On the issue of on-site treatment, Ms. Mason offered this method would have an odour and noted the waste from Nortel (the contents of which is not known) runs through a sewer behind her property and she must put up with the smell.

Ms. Mason urged the Committee to support the staff recommendation; she felt the Region should "get on with the show" and stop spending the taxpayers' money on consultants and purchasing buffer land.

Joe King requested the opportunity to address the committee on his own behalf and was allowed to do so, with leave of the Committee. A copy of the slides used by Mr. King are

held on file with the Regional Clerk. Mr. King noted one of the reasons to support on-site treatment of the toxic waste is out of concern for health. He went on to note that A-Plastic Anemia, a very serious and often fatal disease, that affects on average 15 out of 100,000 people nationally, has a higher than average rate in the Region (17 out of 100,000 people) and an even higher occurrence in the community of Barrhaven (20 out of 100,000 people). Mr. King noted that one known source of Anemia is toxic waste exposure (60% of the cases). He expressed grave concern about piping the toxic waste from Trail Road, through Nepean, Ottawa and Gloucester to the R.O. Pickard Centre and then passing a great many of the elements from this waste into the Ottawa River.

Councillor Munter asked staff to clarify the Committee was not being asked at this time to approve the material to be used for the pipe. Mr. Miller confirmed this. Councillor Munter then asked if the Committee would be given the opportunity at a future time to discuss the permeability and quality of the proposed pipe and then make a decision. Mr. Miller advised staff would review the (Phillips) report referred to by Mr. King, assess it and recommend a pipe that is safe. Councillor Munter asked what the costing was based on. Mr. Miller noted there are a number of different pipe materials available, the cost of the alternatives contained in the report were meant to provide an economic comparison of alternatives; they were not detailed costs and could encompass different materials (e.g. steel pipe, polyethylene pipe, etc.). He emphasized the consultant's evaluation was based on a number of criteria (technical, economic, natural environment and social health criteria); cost only accounted for 10% of the evaluation. In all cases, the pipeline was the preferred option.

Mr. King commented that in June at the public meeting there was pipe technology presented and it is based on that presentation that BSAC believes the polyethylene pipe is preferred. He noted two weeks prior, BSAC tried to establish an information evening to which he had invited Dillon Consulting Engineering (who had originally proposed a wetland solution), as well as a number of other speakers. He said Mr. Miller's office advised Dillon Consulting they could not attend without staff permission.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked staff to respond to this. Mr. Miller advised the project manager from Dillon that worked on the report is in Calgary. Staff contacted him to determine his availability and found it was problematic. He said it would not be right to ask Dillon to attend such a meeting, without being compensated and he felt it appropriate that staff attend such a meeting as well. As well, staff checked with various members of the academic community to see who could attend. Mr. Miller said staff have no difficulty participating in the type of dialogue proposed by Mr. King but would need more than three or four days notice to bring the players together.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen then asked staff to respond to an earlier comment made by Mr. Daechsel about staff referring to the pipes as "throw away pipes". Mr. Miller stated

he had never used that term. However, staff did advise when the Jock River Collector Pipe (which will run parallel to the Jock River) is installed (5 to 10 years from now) a pipeline from the leachate would discharge at that location. Therefore, the routes would intercept and consequently the remaining pipe (for the leachate) would no longer be necessary.

Having heard from all public delegations, the matter was then returned to Committee.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked staff to estimate how long would it take to develop a constructed wetland to manage contaminated groundwater. Mr. McNally advised the original report in 1996, estimated it would take 2 to 3 years before the project was ready to operate. He said staff have not done any recent work on the design of a wetland, pending a decision on the leachate. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked if this work would be done outside or in-house. Mr. Miller advised that constructed wetlands would require a specialized approach and would have to be contracted out.

Councillor Legendre indicated he would be putting forward a motion that biological treatment be explored and that staff report back within a year.

Councillor Stewart indicated she had a similar motion she would be moving on behalf of Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen. She asked staff if it would be compatible to have both a constructed wetland for the contaminated groundwater and a pipeline for the leachate; or would it just double the cost. Mr. McNally advised it would be possible to have both solutions, however, it would result in operating and capital costs for both systems. It was for this reason, staff recommended the pipeline to solve both problems.

Councillor Stewart asked if present and future contamination in the groundwater, could be adequately addressed with a constructed wetland. Mr. McNally confirmed this was the conclusion of the Dillon report on the Nepean Buffer Land Assessment.

The Councillor then asked if the contaminated groundwater would receive a higher level of treatment with a wetland than at R.O. Pickard Centre. Steve Black, Dillon Consulting, one of the authors of the Nepean Buffer Land Assessment report advised his firm has been working with wetlands and other methods of bioremediation for years. He said he felt the wetland solution would be applicable to the Nepean groundwater because of its characteristics. As far as the leachate is concerned, it could be applied, however, it would take considerable pre-treatment in order to make the leachate acceptable to go into a wetland. Mr. Black referred to an MOE position paper on wetlands and advised the effluent that goes on a wetland, has to be as good as effluent you would want coming out. Currently, there is no real way of determining how effective the wetland is going to be. On the issue of quality of treatment, Mr. Black noted with a facility such as the R.O. Pickard Centre, almost any degree of treatment wanted can be carried out and can be

controlled much better than a wetland. Mr. Black went on to say he did not evaluate the treatment of the groundwater as part of the study, however, he opined constituents (e.g. phosphorous) in the contaminated groundwater would likely be at lower concentrations than in the ROPEC effluent. If the contaminated groundwater is sent to the R.O. Pickard Centre, it would take on the characteristics of the plant's effluent. Councillor Stewart asked if the groundwater was necessary to dilute the leachate to send it through the pipe. Mr. Black replied the leachate could be piped on its own. .

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen expressed concern about making a decision on the management of leachate at this time. She noted the Optimization Report would be coming forward and she felt the leachate issue should be discussed at the same time. She asked the Committee to take this into consideration.

She noted a number of speakers from South Nepean and elsewhere had expressed their concerns about the environment, health and safety, property values and concerns for the Jock River. The Councillor noted rural landowners in the immediate vicinity of the landfill, want action taken immediately on the contaminated groundwater because they are concerned about the implications it could have on their farmland and on the quality of the water in the Jock River. They feel the Region should go ahead with the pipeline.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked that the Committee support both Councillor Legendre's and Councillor Stewart's motion. She agreed that a pipeline should be put in now, together with a constructed wetland for the contaminated groundwater.

Councillor Legendre had questions of staff concerning the deferral of this issue until the landfill optimization study is considered. Mr. McNally advised staff anticipate the optimization report will be before the Committee in late May. He offered the optimization study is a technical feasibility study that looks at some of the options with respect to the long term use of the Trail Road Landfill site. Staff will be asking for direction from Committee and Council on whether or not staff should be proceeding with seeking approvals for optimizing the landfill. He said there would be many approval steps to go through before any of the options presented could be undertaken. If staff were successful in the approvals process then at that point Committee and Council would have an option of optimizing the landfill or not.

Councillor Legendre asked if the two issues (i.e. optimization and leachate) were closely coupled. Mr. McNally responded they were not. He said even if Committee and Council choose not to proceed with optimization, the leachate issue will still have to be dealt with.

Councillor Munter said he found the issue very complex and troubling and he felt everyone's concerns were valid. He said regardless of the option chosen, the Region will "face a fight" either from the residents or the MOE. The Councillor stated he would

support the motions for the pilot project, as well as the staff recommendations (subject to the approval of a pilot project).

Councillor Stewart stated the Region has always supported the use of natural systems such as constructed wetlands and she felt this was a great opportunity to support the emerging technologies and do better job of treating the waste. Referring to a point made by Dr. Smith, she agreed that both biological costs and monetary costs must be considered. She urged the Committee to support the motion she was moving on behalf of Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen and noted a final decision on a pilot project would have to be made after seeing the staff report and considering the costs involved.

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would support the staff recommendations. He felt this was not a complex issue; the leachate being generated at the landfill needs treatment and it must be transported to the R.O. Pickard Centre safely. He pointed out the Centre operates under an MOE Certificate of Approval with strict guidelines. The leachate has been trucked there for treatment for the last few years and he said he had not heard of problems with this. With respect to the amending motions, the Councillor noted staff are always examining new technologies and felt that a decision could be made at a later date. He said he had no problem with planting some specialized plants on top of the landfill, however, he would not really like to see a wetland per se when the pipeline can handle both the leachate and contaminated groundwater.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked staff, with respect to the landfill optimization study, if any decision would need to be taken in June, for example, the number of years and the approach. Mr. McNally advised the optimization study will outline a number of possible modifications to the Trail Road site and these would require modifying the Certificate of Approval. He said staff will be asking Committee and Council to endorse the changes to the Certificate of Approval to optimize the landfill site. If the decision is no, not to optimize, then staff will start the search for a new landfill or alternate disposal option. If the decision is to pursue optimization of the current site, then staff will begin discussions with a number of different bodies, including the MOE. Staff would approach the MOE and discuss with them whether or not optimizing the landfill fits into the scoped Environmental Assessment process.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked if the volume of leachate is expected to increase over the next five years. Mr. McNally replied the volume of leachate is primarily related to the amount of precipitation that falls on the open area. He said it should not change significantly while on phase 3; with the move to phase 4, there will be some storage capacity but ultimately, the leachate will reach a level that will require removal.

Councillor Legendre expressed his support for the staff recommendations. He said he was not convinced the leachate could be considered “toxic waste” and noted there is a toxic

waste depot that is separate from the landfill and does not get into the leachate. Referencing earlier speakers comments regarding percentages of contaminants that flow through the R.O. Pickard Centre untreated, the Councillor indicated it would be useful to know the actual amount of these contaminants. For example, 95% of something in the micrograms per million litres would not present a great threat. He noted with today's technology, these things are measurable and should be compared properly.

Speaking to his motion, the Councillor noted the intent was for staff to seek out interested partners and, if partners are found, a pilot be conceptualized, costed out and then report back to the Committee on this within a year.

Committee Chair Hunter, reviewed the two motions before the Committee and deemed them to be substantively different. He ruled that both motions would stand for the Committee's consideration.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Staff explore options for a biological treatment pilot project of leachate and contaminated groundwater including partnering with the research community, the private sector and interested communities and that a report be brought to Committee within a year at most.

CARRIED

Moved by W. Stewart

That staff prepare a report on the feasibility of using a constructed wetland to manage contaminated groundwater for the Nepean landfill site, and that RMOC seek participation with the private sector, Environment Canada or NRC in a pilot project to assess new and emerging technologies to treat leachate with a constructed wetland, and that this report be forwarded to the Committee considering the "landfill optimization study".

CARRIED

(R. van den Ham dissented)

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations as amended.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council:

1. Approve the off-site conveyance of leachate from the Trail Road Waste Facility and leachate contaminated groundwater from the Nepean Landfill Site by pipeline to the R.O. Pickard Environmental Centre for treatment and disposal;
2. Authorize the Environment and Transportation Department to undertake a pipeline route selection process.
3. That Staff explore options for a biological treatment pilot project of leachate and contaminated groundwater including partnering with the research community, the private sector and interested communities and that a report be brought to Committee within a year at most.
4. That staff prepare a report on the feasibility of using a constructed wetland to manage contaminated groundwater for the Nepean landfill site, and that RMOC seek participation with the private sector, Environment Canada or NRC in a pilot project to assess new and emerging technologies to treat leachate with a constructed wetland, and that this report be forwarded to the Committee considering the "landfill optimization study".

CARRIED as amended

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Original signed by
Dawn Whelan

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original confirmed by
Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE CHAIR