

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

11 AUGUST 1998

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Vice Chair: W. Stewart

Members: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, B. Hill, J. Legendre, and R. van den Ham

Regrets: P. Hume, G. Hunter and A. Munter

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 14 July 98.**

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

1. IMPORTATION OF WASTE

- Response to Outstanding Inquiry No. P&E - 5 (98)
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 17 Jul 98

Councillor Legendre expressed disappointment with the staff report, since it seemed to indicate the Region's only ability to limit solid waste entering the Region was through agreements entered into with landfill operators. He asked staff for an explanation as to the appropriate time to enter into such agreements.

Tim Marc, Solicitor, Regional Legal Department, explained that the window of opportunity for new agreements would be when applicants applied for the Certificate of Approval (C of A). He said that in the past, matters had been dealt with as outlined in the staff report because the Region had dealt largely with facilities with existing Certificates of Approval. Mr. Marc outlined that if someone new sought to establish a landfill in Ottawa-Carleton, the Region would, hopefully, at the time the C of A would come forth for

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
  2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 9 September 98 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 12.

comment, be able to negotiate an agreeable figure for the importation of waste, and that subsequently, the Ministry would insert this as a condition in the C of A.

Councillor Legendre said that in a recent conversation with someone from the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MOEE), he had been told the Region could, through its comments, ask for this type of condition, but that the reasons had to be acceptable to the Ministry. The Councillor then asked for a brief historical overview of the process.

Mr. Marc said that although he had not held his current position at the time of the Region's negotiations with Laidlaw, he recalled that achievements had resulted only after litigation. Mr. Marc also confirmed Councillor Legendre's belief that the agreements referenced in the staff report had been entered into as part of the negotiations that had been ongoing even as the litigation had been taking place.

The Councillor felt extraordinary steps had to be taken even to get to the agreement stage.

Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and Transportation Department, commented that the Department had been successful in dealing with the Ministry with respect to the Region's comments on the C of A, and that the local Ministry office was aware of the Region's position in the matter. He felt the Region had a demonstrated track record of trying to promote waste diversion, and that although there were no guarantees, he believed the Region would likely receive good cooperation.

Councillor Legendre made reference to the Moose Creek facility at the intersection of Highways 138 and 417, just beyond the Region's borders. He said he understood the facility was larger than anything in Ottawa-Carleton, and that their C of A allowed them to accept 200,000 tonnes per year, which was larger than Trail Road's C of A.

Mr. McNally said he believed the numbers quoted by the Councillor were correct.

Councillor Legendre said he also understood the Moose Creek C of A to be Province-wide. Given that the facility was just beyond the Region's borders, he wondered whether this might impact Regional policies and operations (e.g., recycling abilities). He asked if staff could provide some information on this issue in future.

Mr. McNally outlined the Moose Creek application was going through an Environmental Assessment (EA) process, and that staff had been monitoring developments for a number of years. He informed that the facility was originally supported by BFI, a large multi-national waste company, but was now being headed by a smaller local company. Mr. McNally said staff were monitoring, and would return to Committee with comments and perhaps future policy decisions with respect to waste management in the Region. He

noted the staff report talked about limiting what came into the Region, but that the question of material leaving the Region had never been studied.

Mr. McNally also confirmed for Councillor Legendre that since the facility was outside of the Region's borders, the Ministry did not ask the Region for comments.

Councillor Bellemare noted the report spoke of a C of A granted to one landfill operator and that the service area was for all of Ontario. He asked if this meant that no waste could be imported from other provinces.

McNally confirmed that this was correct.

The Councillor then said the report spoke to past practice and current policy limiting outside waste to 10%. He asked if staff could confirm that this 10% waste coming from outside of Ottawa-Carleton was coming from immediately-surrounding areas.

Mr. McNally explained that the service area being limited to the Province was part of the C of A, thus, a Ministry requirement. The 10% was a Regional number staff had negotiated through the Consent process. With respect to this process, he said staff received quarterly reports from landfill operators outlining the amount of material they had brought into Ottawa-Carleton. Mr. McNally said he did not believe anything in these reports identified the source of the material, and that staff were assuming the landfill operators were operating in compliance with their C's of A.

Councillor Bellemare stated the Region's authority in this matter was limited to giving out a consent to operate a landfill, and asked legal staff what conditions the Region could impose under a consent agreement.

Mr. Marc explained that staff's interpretation of the Region's consent granting authority was that it was to be used to preserve waste capacity within Ottawa-Carleton to the best extent possible. He outlined that when Environmental Services staff reviewed an application for a consent by facilities other than waste disposal facilities, staff looked to ensuring that the residual waste generated by the facility was at a minimal amount. With respect to waste disposal facilities (landfills), staff looked to ensuring the Region was receiving adequate reporting on the capacity being used up, and also that the Region was being compensated for the loss of waste disposal capacity. This was the sixteen dollar fee per residential and commercial tonne and the ten dollar fee per tonne of construction and demolition waste.

The Councillor then asked if the Region could reasonably withhold its consent to grant a landfill operator the right to operate a landfill in Ottawa-Carleton by specifying in its agreement that any outside waste within that 10% range would have to come from areas

immediately surrounding Ottawa-Carleton, i.e., excluding waste from Southern Ontario or Northern Ontario and limiting waste to Eastern Ontario.

Mr. Marc informed the Region had been successful in negotiating such a provision with Laidlaw in 1991. He stated the 10% amount for Canadian Waste was limited to the “good neighbour” zone, which was, broadly speaking, Eastern Ontario. He also reiterated Mr. McNally’s comment that the achievement of this goal could not be guaranteed, but was a matter for negotiation.

Councillor Bellemare then asked when the present consent agreement with the landfill operator expired.

Mr. Marc believed the provisions on out-of-Region waste expired on May 1, 2000.

Explaining the process for negotiating a consent agreement, Mr. Marc informed that any position taken by the Region would flow through the Planning and Environment Committee, but noted that staff had not yet begun to consider what would happen beyond May 1, 2000.

The Councillor asked what amount of outside waste the landfill operator could import into Ottawa-Carleton if no such consent agreement existed between the Region and the operator under the C of A, and if there was any limit set under the C of A.

Mr. Marc said he did not know what the service area was in the C of A for Canadian Waste.

Mr. McNally believed it was all of Ontario, thus, they could conceivably bring waste from anywhere into that landfill without this arrangement.

Further clarifying for Councillor Bellemare, Mr. Marc explained that the C of A for this landfill operator would not expire, but would last for the life of the landfill.

Mr. McNally pointed out that when the Region dealt with landfill operators, another issue was the amount of residential waste the Region sent to the landfills. He said the Region had some negotiating power with the operators as the agreements were set in place.

Councillor Hill asked if the Region had any control of, or right to limit what kind of refuse it took in. In particular, she said she was thinking of contaminants, nuclear waste and other such dangerous material.

Mr. McNally responded that Regional landfills were licensed for various classes of material by the Ministry. He said the landfills referred to in the report were licensed to

receive solid, non-hazardous waste. In some cases, they were limited to the residential and commercial stream, and in other cases to just the commercial stream. Mr. McNally emphasized that any biological or nuclear waste would require special approvals, and he did not believe the landfills under discussion received this type of waste.

Responding to a question from the Councillor about monitoring, Mr. McNally informed that waste classes were approved by the Province, and that monitoring would be done by the Ministry of the Environment. He said the Department could make some inquiries and bring back information regarding monitoring by the Province, if desired.

Committee Chair Stewart felt that this might be worth looking into.

Mr. McNally then explained he did not want to leave Committee with the impression that there was nothing going into landfill sites that had a "contaminated" title. He informed that the one material accepted at the landfills being discussed, and at the Regional landfill with the appropriate tipping fee, that carried this title was contaminated soils. He said the soils could be handled on-site, and when appropriately handled, they would be tested, deemed no longer contaminated, and used for cover material. Mr. McNally said contaminated soils were an issue the Province was looking at presently when reviewing waste regulations.

There being no further discussion, Committee received the staff report.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee receive this report for information.**

RECEIVED

PLANNING ITEMS

2. Proposed Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier  
International Airport Master Plan \_\_\_\_\_  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report  
dated 30 Jul 98

Pierre Lanoix, Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority, introduced Diane Waller, also of the Airport Authority, and Bob Ridley of Maxgroup Associates, who helped work on the Airport Master Plan project.

Mr. Lanoix then gave the Committee a brief overview of the Airport Master Plan process (copy of slide presentation on file with the Regional Clerk).

Chair Stewart said she understood that the deadline for Council's comments to be incorporated into the process by the Airport Authority had already passed. She asked how Council's comments would be taken into account.

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, said staff had received the Master Plan on 10 July, asking for technical comments by 31 July, which did not allow any time for it to be brought forward to Committee and Council. Ms. Sweet said staff had drafted and sent along the comments, which were attached to the staff report, and said it was her understanding the comments would be considered by the Airport Authority as input into its Master Plan.

Mr. Lanoix confirmed that the comments contained in the staff letter dated 30 July would be evaluated and considered. He said the Authority was still reviewing comments from various agencies, and that despite a very tight schedule, there was still time for comment.

Councillor Legendre noted that with respect to public transit, the report and the staff letter spoke to improving bus transit in both the short term and in the long term. He observed that at present, buses arrive, deposit passengers closest to the departure area, then sit empty. The Councillor said OC Transpo staff had informed him that the bus could not subsequently wait near the arrivals area for people leaving the terminal. He offered that given a choice between taxi or bus, it would make a large difference if the passengers could see a bus there, in terms of visibility, availability and convenience. Councillor Legendre said he could not understand why the bus would not be allowed to wait in the arrivals area, and he had been told by OC Transpo staff this had been considered, but there was a stumbling block with respect to the Airport Authority.

Mr. Lanoix said he was unaware of the impossibility of parking the bus in the arrivals area, and said the Authority would look into the matter. He pointed out, however, that the Airport Authority's numbers had indicated that most usage of OC Transpo was by airport employees, and not the traveling public.

Councillor Legendre noted the presentation indicated providing eventually for a light rail link, however, the diagram shows light rail feeds the parking garage and he felt it should be serving the terminal. He added this would be in harmony with encouraging mass transit, noting the link should not be overly inconvenient.

Mr. Lanoix said the Airport Authority is committed to providing mass transit ability to their customers as spelled out in the Master Plan. He noted designing the facilities will not occur for six months, therefore, they will wait to see what develops with respect to light rail. He added if the Region commits to light rail, the Authority will commit to providing passengers with full access to it.

Councillor Legendre felt that since the Authority will be starting a new terminal from zero, a light rail link should be incorporated in the plans, even if the Region delays light rail, so that future integration is made easier.

Mr. Lanoix agreed, however, there are many issues that would need to be addressed such as: financing, under or above ground, easements, etc.

Councillor Holmes asked if once this report and staff response is official through Regional Council, will the Region be receiving an official statement in response.

Mr. Ridley indicated they are preparing a response to the letter now. He also noted, in response to a comment made earlier about their general view of the Region's comments, there was nothing surprising as they had met with Regional staff on a number of occasions. He said they will be revising the Master Plan and it will go back to the Board in September.

Councillor Holmes agreed with staff and Councillor Legendre's comments on the present access of OC Transpo, noting it is impossible to use and difficult to find. She also noted the possibility of shoulder lanes on the Airport Parkway used for buses and the pilot light rail study going through. She felt if the study was successful, there may not be a need for twinning the Airport Parkway in time. Staff have requested in the letter to defer twinning the Airport Parkway until Regional Council has taken a position on the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan (ROP), to remove this project from the ROP. Councillor Holmes ask for Mr. Lanoix's comments on this.

Mr. Lanoix explained the Authority looks at the airport as a Regional asset and he noted the Airport Parkway was designed to provide access to the airport. He felt as access ramps are being built, the capacity of the traveling public to reach the airport is being eroded as the parkway is acting as a feeder to the southern communities. He added they want to preserve the access to the airport, however, with additional ramps opening up access may be limited or slowed down. He indicated the Authority will be participating in the debate regarding this proposed amendment to the ROP.

In response to Councillor Holmes question on why the Authority did not oppose the Huntclub ramps at the time, Mr. Lanoix explained, in the Regional context, the ramps themselves do not propose a problem, as the 1997 ROP looks at twinning the parkway. He again reiterated the Authority wants to preserve access to the airport.

Councillor Holmes inquired if light rail, should it go ahead, and using the shoulder lanes for buses, provides sufficient access until 2020, did Mr. Lanoix have any comments on this.

Mr. Lanoix indicated that whatever measures are put in place to ensure access to the airport, the Authority would not have a problem with, however, they felt it is a Regional concern and should be addressed by the Region.

Councillor Holmes noted the reference by staff in the letter to a new road link to the central area and a request to remove the reference from the airport Master Plan. She asked what this new road link to the central area would be.

Mr. Ridley said the reference to a new road link will be altered or removed. He noted it was the intent to recognize the airport was a Regional facility and to try and find a way to improve the connections to Quebec. He added the reference should have said the central core in general, meaning Hull and Ottawa. In response to further questions from Councillor Holmes, Mr. Ridley explained there was no particular suggestion for the road link; they were trying to recognize a roadway would have to provide links to Quebec as well, as this is the only international airport serving that area.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen noted the statistics in the slide presentation showing how few numbers of people are actually using public transit. She asked when the research was done and did the research look at why. She also asked if there has been a decline in public transit usership.

Mr. Ridley responded the numbers were based on counts done in February 1998, along with interview studies of the terminal users, however, the question “why” people were not using public transit was not asked. He noted the study revealed almost all transit users were employees.

Councillor Legendre, referring to a letter received by Chair Hunter from the Federation of Citizens’ Associations (FCA), asked Mr. Lanoix if the final Master Plan would be circulated to the public for comment.

Mr. Lanoix informed the Councillor that three open houses at various stages of the Master Plan had already taken place with the last one in April 1998. He noted the public has also been consulted through representatives of the public. He indicated it is not their intent to further consult the general public and copies of summaries has been sent out to 500 stakeholders such as: .municipal councils, media, business organizations, etc.

Mr. Lanoix further informed Councillor Legendre the broad direction of the Master Plan, i.e. where the new terminal and access roads would be, has not changed since the April 1998 public consultation meeting, they are just refining it based on comments from Regional staff and other entities.

Councillor Legendre asked if the Authority would have a problem with a motion that directs them to circulate the final Master Plan to the general public for comment before a final decision is made. Mr. Lanoix felt it would be too late at this time to solicit more comments from the public at large on the Master Plan; the consultation process ended on 31 July 1998.

Councillor Bellemare noted the letter sent to Regional staff makes reference to the north field runway in that the Master Plan proposes to keep it open or operational in order to keep slow aircraft off the main runway system, and, if that runway were to be closed, it is expected the Authority would have to open a parallel runway in 5 years unless that type of air traffic were to be redirected to airports such as Carp or Gatineau. He asked to what extent the proposed Master Plan links or incorporates those two airports.

Mr. Lanoix explained the Master Plan is for the Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport. He noted there is a parallel study ongoing looking at the aviation airports in the area which he has been working on with Regional staff. He explained the Master Plan addresses issues of the north field runway in a way that if shut down, traffic would or might be diverted to the main runways, therefore, forcing the construction of a new runway.

In response to further questions from Councillor Bellemare, Mr. Lanoix indicated the Authority is working closely with Regional staff to look at integration of the airports and general aviation in the area. He added the north field runway will need resurfacing in the next 3 to 4 years and they are not sure if the Authority or the users can afford it. The Authority has been dealing with this issue for the last year and a half and has not been able to resolve it.

Councillor Bellemare asked if staff had sent a copy of the letter to the City of Gloucester in light of the need for an outlet to the RMO West Rideau Collector through the South Urban community development (City of Gloucester) with respect to sanitary drainage for development of the airport lands south of runway 07/25. He noted the letter also stated the Region would be looking to explore servicing options with the City of Gloucester.

Ms. Sweet said a copy of the letter had been sent, however, not specifically highlighting this item.

Mr. Ridley indicated they met with the Region and City of Gloucester on this issue, however, the preference of the parties was that it be resolved at a future date with more meetings.

Councillor Bellemare requested the PDA Commissioner's office send this letter to the City of Gloucester drawing their attention to this particular issue.

Chair Stewart had some concerns with the timing of the public consultation. She said as the Councillor for the area immediately north of the airport, she felt if this is approved, there are a great number of people in that community who do not know that it would count on a six lane Huntclub Road between Uplands and Riverside Drive. She asked what the future process will be to accomplish the necessary road improvements.

Mr. Ridley offered some general comments noting the airport Master Plan is the status quo with the exception of the terminal building. He indicated the land uses are within the lands under the jurisdiction of the airport and are largely a slight evolution of what is in ROP currently.

Chair Stewart had received an inquiry from one of her constituents asking what the chain of accountability is for the Airport Authority. She was aware they are appointed by different groups and agencies, however, was unsure who the Authority is accountable to.

Mr. Marc explained the members are appointed by a number of bodies including the Region. He felt that if Regional Council took a position or if there was a particular outcry from the public, the members would take into account their views, however, there is no formal process beyond consideration of who Regional Council and others bodies will appoint when that time comes.

Councillor Doucet felt the airport Master Plan was a useful exercise as it has indicated clearly that 92 % of those coming to and leaving the airport are doing so in a private car or taxi. He felt there are two choices to resolve this: more road capacity can be built, which will push more traffic into the Councillor's community and centretown or the percentage points could be moved down onto public transit. He noted hotel shuttle buses take twice as many passengers as OC Transpo. He reiterated Councillors Legendre and Holmes' comments that no one even knows how to get to the airport by bus. The Councillor felt the Master Plan is optimistic and gives the Region good reasons to go with transit and light rail.

Councillor Doucet brought to the Committee's attention the last line of staff's letter on page 10, "*We would therefore request that this aspect of the Master Plan not be finalized but be deferred until Regional Council has taken a position on the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan.*" He suggested a motion to add to the end of that sentence "*and until evaluation of light rail is completed*" to make it clear the Region is not looking at twinning the Airport Parkway until reasonable feedback on alternatives to cars is received.

Councillor Legendre had some concerns with the public consultation process. He noted there had been a briefing previously by Mr. Lanoix on the Master Plan and assumed when

he saw the report on the agenda that a copy of the Master Plan had been sent to him. Upon investigating, he found only one copy had been received by the RMOC on 10 July 1998 with a request for comment by 31 July 1998. The Councillor felt two weeks for the Region to give comment was insufficient and recommended the Authority take a couple of months, make the Master Plan available to the public at large in hard copy for those interested to examine it and give proper feedback. Councillor Legendre introduced a Motion to that effect.

Regarding aspects centering around the accommodation of public transit, Councillor Legendre said he liked the general concept and methods of implementation proposed by the Authority. He stated the airport was a major Regional economic development facility, and that it was necessary to take care in maintaining it to ensure its efficiency was not compromised. The Councillor said he wanted to ensure the airport served the Region well, but said he saw no urgency in rushing the matter, and felt another two months could be provided for consultation, which would serve to benefit both the Airport Authority and the Region.

Councillor Beamish said he could not support Councillor Legendre's Motion. Relating the Airport Authority's Master Plan process to the Region's own Official Plan process, Councillor Beamish felt adequate time had been given for public consultation and input. He noted a draft report had been released in April, and that this document should have been studied by the various interested organizations over the past four months. The Councillor felt it was wrong to ask the Airport Authority to change its planning process and timelines after the report had been finalized.

Councillor Legendre recalled he had attended a briefing on the issue, but said that the Region and the public had not yet seen the present document on which Committee and Council were being asked to comment.

With respect, Chair Stewart informed that she had received a copy of the draft Master Plan document in May, as did Councillor Beamish, who pointed out, with respect, that it had been advertized in both his local newspaper and in The Ottawa Citizen.

Councillor Holmes felt it was essential that the Airport Authority took the matter of public transportation seriously, and did something to address the need for better bus access and the soon-to-be need for light rail. She asked the Authority to ensure these issues be integrated with the airport as much as possible to try to increase the use of public transit access, and to perhaps preclude the twinning of the Airport Parkway. Councillor Holmes said she was happy with the comments outlined in the staff letter.

There being no further discussion, Committee then considered the following Motion by Councillor Legendre.

Moved by J. Legendre

**That copies of the Master Plan be made available to Members of Council, interested public agencies and citizens' organizations, and that Committee recommend that Council ask the Airport Authority to delay its final approval until the Fall to allow for input.**

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....4

YEAS: B. Hill and J. Legendre....2

Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council endorse the letter dated 30 July 98, attached at Annex A, as its position on the Airport Master Plan.**

CARRIED

3. USE OF PETRIE ISLAND

- Response to Inquiry No. P&E - 10 (98)
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 23 Jul 98

Councillor van den Ham said talks with staff had addressed his concerns regarding Petrie Island, as confirmed in the report. He informed Committee he had visited the island the previous Sunday and had been impressed with the organization demonstrated by The Friends of Petrie Island in living up to their commitment to monitor situations on the island. The Councillor said there were concerns with regard to roadside parking, but as there was no truck traffic on weekends, this was minimized. Weekday parking, when trucks were running, was more of a problem, but was being dealt with by the sandpit operator. Councillor van den Ham also asked staff for information on the latest Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) position with regard to Wetlands reevaluation on the island.

Ms. Sweet said she understood MNR was waiting for a proposal on what staff would be looking at, and that staff would have to undertake an environmental impact statement of some sort to study the impact of whatever was being proposed on that wetland. She noted the Ministry had agreed to a slight modification resulting in a "tweaking" of the wetland boundaries.

There being no further discussion, Committee then received the staff report.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee receive this report for information.**

RECEIVED

INQUIRIES

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. OPPI Award for Sylvie Grenier  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's memo  
dated 22 Jul 98

The Committee Chair asked if Ms. Grenier was present to receive the Members Service Award from the Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI). Ms. Sweet informed that Ms. Grenier was unavailable. Chair Stewart offered Ms. Grenier the Committee's congratulations on receiving a well-deserved honour.

Councillor Legendre asked if a formal presentation had been planned. Ms. Sweet said Ms. Grenier would be receiving the award at a conference in Kingston during the week of the 17th of August, in addition to which, the Planning and Development Approvals Department would be receiving one for the Regional Official Plan. Ms. Sweet said a member of OPPI would be asked to present the awards at a subsequent meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee in the Fall of this year.

2. 1997 Biosolids Land Application Programme and Management Plan Update  
- Director Water Environment Protection Division, Environment and  
Transportation Department memo dated 24 Jul 98

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

*Original signed by*  
*Kim Johnston*

*Original confirmed by*  
*Gord Hunter*

---

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

---

COMMITTEE CHAIR