

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

11 JULY 2000

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 27 June 2000.

CARRIED

POSTPONEMENTS/DEFERRALS

1. WILDLIFE PROTECTION DURING CONSTRUCTION
 - *Deferred from Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 27 June 2000*
 - Planning & Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 08 June 2000

Leslie Paterson, A/Director, Development Approvals Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, provided Committee with a brief overview of the staff report.

Councillor Munter stated he felt such a protocol would be a positive thing in that there is nothing currently on record to address the problem and it would at least provide guidelines to try to reduce the amount of conflict between development and wildlife.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 09 August 2000 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number ~~60~~ *Council was requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider Item 5 at its meeting of 12 July 2000 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 61.*

Chair Hunter asked what was defined as a “construction period”. Ms. Paterson replied this only applies to the period in which construction is taking place on the site, right from grading and clearing to actually building the houses. The Chair commented this could take years (i.e. from the time the site is cleared to the time construction is completed). Ms. Paterson acknowledged this, but noted the Region would have no control over this.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegation.

Lois K. Smith offered a couple of suggestions with respect to this issue. She noted that garbage attracts wildlife and, if contractors were diligent about cleaning up food and other garbage daily, wildlife would not be attracted to construction sites. As well, she pointed out that aluminum rings, cans, bottles and other such trash pose a danger to wildlife, as they often get trapped in these things and starve to death. Miss Smith also felt that pipe openings should be covered by means of screening to keep wildlife out.

Committee Chair Hunter asked staff if contractors were governed by a by-law with respect to garbage clean-up. Ms. Paterson stated she was not sure if there was a by-law, but pointed out that one of the key guidelines that staff want to prepare would be for contractors. She noted there had been a number of suggestions along this line, from other people and she felt that often, providing education/information was sufficient.

Councillor van den Ham stated he agreed with the overall spirit of what the report was trying to accomplish; however, he said he also saw the potential that contractors would be dictated to, as to how to do their work. The Councillor noted the report stated the construction industry was part of the consultation group, but it did not say if they agreed with it. He asked for staff comment.

Ms. Paterson advised the Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders’ Association supports the protocol and in fact, some of their suggestions were incorporated into the policy. She said staff had never intended to take a regulatory approach to this, but rather they view it as an opportunity to educate all those involved in construction.

Councillor van den Ham said he took some comfort in hearing this but he noted many times previously he had been advised that something was “not a big deal”, only to find out when it was actually implemented, that it was quite onerous on the parties involved. Ms. Paterson advised

staff intend to report back to Committee next year to advise how effective the protocol has been.

Councillor Munter pointed out that so far this year, in Kanata alone, there have been incidences in urban neighbourhoods in construction areas involving not only deer but also a bear and a coyote. He said the reality is that on the periphery of the urban area, as wildlife is displaced, there is an impact which has the potential to be dangerous for both people and animals.

The Councillor then referred to the section in the report, entitled "Education of future homeowners". He said although this is not actually included in the construction protocol, he felt it to be an incredibly important component. Councillor Munter expressed the hope the homebuilders (in new subdivisions where they can predict this will be a problem) would provide homebuyers with pamphlets from organizations such as the Ottawa-Carleton Wildlife Centre, containing information such as the resource number to call and information on how to minimize problems and resolve conflicts.

The Committee then approved the staff recommendation.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend to Council that the Wildlife Protection During Construction Protocol attached as Annex 1 be used by the Planning and Development Approvals Department during the review of development applications in Ottawa-Carleton.

CARRIED

JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES / PLANNING ITEM

2. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER
DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN (97) AMENDMENT 1
PROPOSED WASTEWATER/LEACHATE PIPELINE FROM
TRAIL ROAD WASTE FACILITY

 - Environment and Transportation Commissioner's and Planning and
Development Approvals Commissioner's joint report dated 27 June 2000

Committee Chair Hunter began by reading a statement required under the Planning Act, wherein he advised that anyone, whose intention it was to appeal Regional Official Plan Amendment 1 to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), must either voice their objections at the public meeting or

submit their comments in writing prior to Amendment 1 being adopted by Regional Council. Failure to do so could result in refusal/dismissal of the appeal by the OMB.

Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division, Environment and Transportation Department (ETD), introduced Joseph Phelan, Senior Project Manager, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, and Dave McCartney, Manager, Environmental Projects Branch, Environment and Transportation Department. Messrs. Miller, Phelan and McCartney then briefed the Committee on the staff report.

Councillor Molly McGoldrick-Larsen asked if, as part of background documentation in costing out transportation of leachate and groundwater contamination to the sewage treatment plant, costing was done on the transportation of both leachate and groundwater.

Mr. Miller advised that presently the Region is trucking approximately 10 tanker trucks of leachate each working day at a cost of approximately \$300,000 to \$400,000 (annual operating costs to the Solid Waste Division). He said currently, contaminated groundwater was not being trucked but estimated there would be between five to eight times the volume of contaminated groundwater to deal with. If the Region were to truck it, the cost would be in excess of \$2 million. He explained this was not part of the analysis with respect to costing.

Mr. Sheflin added only the actual amount currently being spent was used, not a potential future amount. He said staff were being conservative in this analysis and the project was justified based solely on the current cost of transportation of the leachate.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned if the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) would be concerned the Region had not included in its analysis, the cost of transporting the contaminated groundwater. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, noted the evaluation by the Environment and Transportation Commissioner was a valid one and he said he could see no cause for concern if the matter went before the OMB. He said if it was justified on the basis of leachate alone, it was clear any additional groundwater that had to be put in the system, would only serve to strengthen the case at the OMB.

Councillor McGoldrick Larsen then asked if an analysis was done on components of the combined leachate and groundwater (as opposed to separate analysis). Mr. McCartney advised the hydrolic analysis was done on the assumption of a combined flow, the total volume under peak flow and average day conditions. As well, experts looked at the impact of the leachate on both the leachate pipeline material itself, as well as the downstream piping facilities and it was not a concern.

The Councillor then had questions with respect to the servicing of the lands at Strandherd and Highway 416. She stated she had discussions with the City of Nepean and they are expecting the interim servicing report to come forward in September. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked if staff had consulted with Nepean as to the timeline for interim servicing and what possibilities might be there.

Mr. Miller advised Regional staff have been communicating with City of Nepean staff. He pointed out Nepean is looking at this from an interim servicing point of view, using a small flow projection with the intent of using the existing sewer system as much as possible. He said Nepean is looking at a number of routes, including some right through the Barrhaven community. Mr. Miller explained what staff refer to in the report is the whole sewer system which he estimated would be at least seven to eight years away and would cost in excess of \$10 million.

Councillor Legendre referenced page 15 of the staff report and the impact on Richmond and its forcemain. He said there had been some concern that the leachate would be filling up the capacity of that pipe but staff are saying there would be the ability to pump on an intermittent basis. He took this to mean when Richmond was getting high flows, the Region would stop feeding. He said although this sounded reasonable, he believed that high flow condition would likely happen simultaneously at Richmond and at Trail Road, as in the case of excess precipitation or snow melt.

Mr. Miller noted the "peak event" problems in Richmond occurred possibly once every two years during the spring melt period, and appeared to be from infiltration into the sewer system. He said careful analysis indicated there would be adequate capacity in the forcemain over 99% of the time. Another benefit of putting more flow into the pipe during low flow conditions would be to decrease detention time of the wastewater from Richmond, which would also lead to fewer problems with hydrogen sulfide gas.

Responding to another question from the Councillor, Mr. Miller explained there were no plans to build storage capacity at Trail Road to hold contaminated groundwater and leachate during peak flows. He explained the landfill was lined to contain this material, and that staff would continue their monitoring efforts. In extreme cases, he noted there was a trucking option, but there was no desire to use this on a continuous basis.

Councillor Legendre then had questions concerning the cost of Routes 3 and 4. Mr. McCartney explained the estimated capital cost of Route 3, at approximately 5,725 metres, was \$2,490,000.00, whereas Route 4, at 6,125 metres, was \$2,285,000.00. He said a number of factors made Route 3 more expensive, including its placement under Highway 416. Mr. McCartney further explained that if Committee wished to include the operating costs and

life cycle costing over a longer period of time, these were estimated at \$3.725 million for Route 3, and \$3.22 million for Route 4. He confirmed all other route alternatives were more expensive.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked if the capital cost requirement for a proposed future booster pumping station on the Richmond forcemain had been included in the costing analysis for Route 4. Mr. McCartney said this additional cost was not included as it had already been accounted for in Richmond's future. He explained that because the pipeline would use the Richmond forcemain's off-peak capacity, there would be no impact on when the future boosting pumping station would be required. He stated there would be a future cost requirement for the booster pumping station even if another route were chosen for the pipeline, and the pipeline would not accelerate this need.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen then asked if the same standard had been applied to all routes during the evaluation. She noted Route 4 proposed to use a double-walled pipe for a portion of its route under the Jock River, and asked if the same costing standard would be used as that applied to Route 3, using an existing double-walled pipe already in place under the river. Mr. McCartney explained the costs calculated for Route 3 included the replacement of the existing pipe underneath the Jock River, installed by Monarch Development Corp. as part of its development. This jointed polyvinyl chloride (PVC) water distribution type of piping system would be replaced with the same type of cased, continuously fused pipe as proposed for Route 4, to make the comparisons equal. As well, Mr. McCartney explained, the costing had been done in this fashion because staff had assured the public the Region would provide a high level of protection to the Jock River system.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked if this was the factor that had driven up the cost of Route 3, which resulted in the lower cost of Route 4 being the preferred alternative. Mr. McCartney confirmed this was one of the things that increased the cost of Route 3 over Route 4; however, he noted this was not the only factor.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegations.

Ernie Lauzon explained he would speak on behalf of Werner Daeschel, who was unable to attend for medical reasons. Mr. Lauzon said Mr. Daeschel was opposed to the amendment, and preferred on-site treatment at the landfill site.

Roger Pyper, speaking on behalf of the Citizens Review Committee (CRC), recommended deferral of ROPA 1, based on a procedural problem resulting from a Motion moved at Council on 9 June 1999. He said the Motion, which originated with the Planning and Environment Committee, required an anaerobic digester be incorporated in the Trail Road Waste Facility

Optimization Expansion Project. Mr. Pyper said the CRC had determined the directives of this Motion had not yet been carried out.

The speaker said the CRC sees the optimization of Trail Road, the groundwater/leachate pipeline and pre-treatment of leachate to be closely aligned. He recounted the June, 1999 Motion asked that an anaerobic digester be added to the current process of re-circulating leachate through the landfill, the effect of which would be to enhance the reduction of waste in the landfill, thereby contributing to optimization. Mr. Pyper noted documentation regarding the Trail Road Waste Facility Optimization Expansion Project stated that groundwater leaving Trail Road met Ministry of the Environment (MOE) Reasonable Use guidelines and that surface water met MOE standards and objectives. He felt that since the groundwater met standards approved by the province, it was reasonable to conclude that leachate was the only problem requiring amelioration. He also believed that since putting leachate into a pipeline would require Council to issue a waiver to its Sewer Use By-law, there likely was a hazardous condition that needed exploration to determine to whom the hazard applied.

While attempting to determine the effects of contaminated groundwater and leachate, Mr. Pyper said the CRC had learned that in addition to the Sewer Use By-law, another standard had to be met; a Discharge Agreement Maximum Limit (DAML). He said the CRC attended a public meeting where the need to treat leachate in order to improve it was acknowledged, but that for the moment, the landfill would have to continue to operate under a waiver of the Sewer Use By-law. Mr. Pyper said no mention had been made of the DAML at the same public meeting. He felt that in light of MOE standards which were less than adequate at protecting public health, a higher standard might be required.

The speaker said a true optimization of the landfill would provide an opportunity to incorporate innovative technologies in compliance with the stated policies of Regional Council (ROP, Section 4.1.2 (8)). He also felt that once a pipeline was installed, the policy of at-source pollution prevention might be ignored.

Mr. Pyper recalled that Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen had alluded to a study regarding the conveyance of leachate in groundwater to the R.O. Pickard Environmental Centre (ROPEC) that did not factor in the cost of groundwater recovery and piping. He noted the inference that piping contaminated groundwater to ROPEC would be cheaper than transporting it by truck, but that this had not been costed in the original study. He also said wastewater treatment technologies currently operated by local companies could provide opportunities for compliance with Council's policy objectives to "facilitate the creation of jobs and strengthen the Regional economy through planning and infrastructure decisions which support industrial and business development" (ROP, Section 4.1.1 (1)). The speaker also found it curious that the amendment spoke to an issue in the ROP addressing solid waste, yet he noted contaminated groundwater

and leachate were liquids. He added that liquids are normally transported by pipe to ROPEC for treatment, yet the amendment did not append itself to anything dealing with sewers.

Mr. Pyper said the CRC was trying to get information on an organization called SUBBOR (**Super Blue Box Recycling**, an affiliate of Eastern Power Limited, Toronto), which had been in receipt of some Federal assistance. In closing, he reiterated the CRC's request for deferral, in light of its view that the Motion of 9 June 1999 had not yet been acted upon.

In light of the many points touched upon by the delegation, Councillor Beamish asked for clarification as to the immediate nature of the delegation's deferral request. Chair Hunter offered the CRC was asking for action on the request for a study for an anaerobic digester system at Trail Road. Because this had not yet been acted upon, the CRC felt the amendment should be deferred until the technology could be examined to see if it could be incorporated in leachate management. Mr. Pyper added that if this technology were explored, it might be discovered that treatment might be done at source.

Responding to a question from Councillor Legendre regarding the status of the anaerobic digester, Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and Transportation Department, explained the motion regarding anaerobic digestion had originally come forward in conjunction with the Trail Road Optimization Project, and that different alternatives were being examined regarding the project. He noted staff had met with the CRC in relation to the Optimization Project and the role of anaerobic digestion. Mr. McNally stated the Optimization Project currently has draft terms of reference. The comment period has concluded and staff are working with the consultant to review the comments received. Mr. McNally said staff would review the draft terms of reference to ensure that the option for an anaerobic digester is identified.

Mr. McNally confirmed for Councillor Legendre that staff have progressed with the anaerobic digester as part of the optimization project, with which it was originally identified. He explained the digester was not identified in conjunction with the leachate program. He outlined that staff were asked, as part of the optimization, to consider using anaerobic digestion and poplar trees. Mr. McNally confirmed staff were going forward with the optimization project, whose most significant first step involves preparing a draft terms of reference for an environmental assessment (EA).

Councillor Legendre said he too recalled the digester had been discussed as part of the optimization project, but he believed Committee had been considering leachate and contaminated groundwater around Trail Road as part of one package. He asked whether proceeding with the pipeline would mean forgetting about the digester.

Mr. McNally explained that optimizing Trail Road included establishing more air space at the site. He said that assuming the Region received MOE approval on the terms of reference, proceeded with an EA, and secured more air space, the use of various technologies including anaerobic digestion could be incorporated in the site. Mr. McNally confirmed that even if a digester were to be used at Trail Road, there would still be a need to convey the waste fluid somewhere. The digester's purpose would not be to digest fluids flowing from the facility, but would ensure they were in a better state.

Elaborating on the DAML for Councillor Legendre, Mr. McNally explained the Regional Regulatory Code (RRC) requires a special discharge agreement to allow for the discharge of leachate to the sewer treatment works. He said as a result, there is discharge agreement in place for Trail Road.

At Councillor Legendre's request, Mr. Pyper explained what caused him to raise the issue of the DAML. He said in order to pipe leachate, the requirements of the Sewer Use By-law had to be met and there were three chemicals emanating from Trail Road that did not meet these standards. He further explained the CRC had learned that Trail Road was operating under a waiver of the by-law, and that in addition to the Sewer Use By-law, an additional condition had to be met, the DAML. He pointed out that for two years, xylene gas was in excess of the DAML, the consequence of which was that two regulations intended to establish a minimum standard were being breached.

Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, explained the DAML allowed the Region to exceed certain normal bounds in exceptional cases, but that this excess was carefully monitored. He said the Region set the limits, monitored the site to ensure that limits were not exceeded, and strictly monitored leachate as recommended in MOE guidelines.

At Councillor Beamish's request, Mr. Sheflin clarified the DAML is established to do two things; to protect the Region's system and treatment plant, and to ensure that effluent leaving the plant does not exceed MOE guidelines for dumping into the river. He said the Region had a Certificate of Approval (C of A) that had to be met at all times.

Councillor Beamish noted these agreements did not apply solely to landfill sites. He asked if the Region also entered into such discharge agreements with anyone else having an abnormal type of sewer discharge, such as a manufacturing plant. The Commissioner explained the Region has an Industrial Sewer By-law and the Region works with several hundred local industries. He noted there are approximately 20 such agreements, which are only required for those industries that are in excess of the limits. He confirmed that with the DAML, the Region was merely treating its landfill as a separate industry, similar to a private industry.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked staff about the SUBBOR project currently under way in Guelph, about the Region's involvement in the project, and about its future potential, depending on the outcome of the optimization study.

Mr. McNally said staff endeavor to keep abreast of the most current undertakings and newest technologies. With respect SUBBOR, he said staff had earlier this year met with a representative who advised of a demonstration project currently being developed in Guelph. He noted that subsequently, the Region had agreed to participate as a monitor in verifying the SUBBOR technology at the request of an agency working in conjunction with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. He said one of the seeming environmental benefits of the SUBBOR technology is that it offers advances with respect to greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. McNally said the social and economic impacts will also be studied, and that Committee will be updated as information becomes available. As to the long-term possibilities for the use of SUBBOR or other technologies, Mr. McNally said he did not believe the installation of a leachate pipeline or the landfill optimization would put the Region in a position where alternate innovative technologies could not be considered. He noted that ultimately, there was still a need for some disposal, with Trail Road being the Region's disposal asset. He emphasized that with the optimization project, staff were trying make the best possible use of this asset.

Chair Hunter noted the delegation had asked for deferral of this item until there had been further study regarding the anaerobic digester option. He asked if any member of Committee was prepared to move such a Motion.

Mr. Sheflin drew the Committee's attention to a paragraph in a letter from the MOE dated 24 June, 1999, which stated, "Recent progress with respect to contaminated groundwater at the Nepean Landfill Site is unsatisfactory and must be resolved without further delay."

Councillor Hill proposed the following Motion:

That the pipeline route selection (Recommendation No. 2 of the report) be deferred until the City of Nepean Sewer Servicing Study is available (which is expected in September of 2000), outlining flow capacity in the Barrhaven sewer system.

The Committee Chair acknowledged the Motion of Deferral, but noted this was different from what the delegation was requesting. There being no further Motions, the Committee resumed hearing from the following public delegations:

Alastair Munro, a resident at the intersection of the Twin Island Bridge and Richmond Road, told the Committee he owns a farm abutting the road allowance where the new leachate pipeline

was being proposed to go. A long-time resident of the area, Mr. Munro gave an historical perspective of rural life, noting a general degeneration in the quality of life over the past 35 years, beginning with the inception of the first landfill. He felt the problems of dealing with landfill-related problems such as odour, dust and dirt were going to be compounded by the installation of a leachate pipeline. Commenting on the consultative process, Mr. Munro felt that although there had been opportunity for input, he believed the decision to select Route 4 had been made largely to appease Barrhaven residents, who greatly outnumbered the rural residents. Referring to the criteria indicators of capital and operating costs, the speaker felt it made more economic sense to install a pipe that was going to convey leachate eastwards in the east to begin with.

Mr. Munro also noted that for Route 3, a double-walled pipe would have to be installed 150 metres east of the river because of sandy soil conditions. He said no mention had been made of using double-walled pipe along Route 4 when going through sandy soil west of Moodie Drive. The speaker felt a double standard was being applied, as much of the area encompassed by Route 4 contained sandy soil. He also noted no mention had been made of any increased pump capacity for Richmond, and he felt the selection of Route 4 would hold up development in Richmond. Mr. Munro understood that a new sewer would be added to serve a new industrial park between Highway 416 and Strandherd Drive, and felt that this was where the leachate pipeline should go. He said he did not oppose the piping of the leachate, and felt there was a greater hazard to convey the leachate by trucks. In closing, Mr. Munro recommended deferring a decision on Route 4 until the study on the new sewer in Barrhaven was completed. He implored the Committee not to proceed with ROPA 1 at this time.

Councillor Legendre noted Mr. Munro's concerns regarding potential impacts, and asked how an underground pipeline would affect the speaker's property. Although he was unsure of the immediate impact, Mr. Munro felt there were alternatives to piping leachate into the Richmond sewer, which he felt would withhold development in Richmond. The speaker felt that connection to the sewer proposed for Barrhaven within the next five to six years would be a better long-term solution.

Councillor Stewart noted Mr. Munro had alluded to a "double standard" in terms of a single walled pipe going through the rural area versus a double walled pipe elsewhere, and asked staff to explain. Mr. Miller said a double-walled pipe had been planned for the section of the route under the Jock River only.

Councillor Stewart noted that in the staff report under "Complexity of Operations", only Route 4, in the rural area, did not appear to require an additional odour control system. She asked why this was so, when odour control was required of all other routes.

Mr. McCartney explained a temporary biofilter installed on the Glen Cairn collector in Kanata would be used to control odour for the time being. A more permanent solution would be to “piggyback” onto the new facility slated for construction next year.

Councillor van den Ham noted he had not yet familiarized himself with the background documentation, however, he found it odd that one of the complexities of operation identified for Route 3 had been that the system would be run by another municipality. He said this would end this year, and that it appeared the selection had been skewed toward Route 4. Noting these types of operations were usually forced onto those in rural areas, he asked Mr. Munro if anyone in the rural area had participated in the review process.

Mr. Munro said he had attended the first public meetings in May and June when he had learned of a route proposed for his area, and had provided some input. He said he had not attended a subsequent meeting in June as he believed a decision had already been made.

Councillor van den Ham then asked for details on the group which had been formed to partake in the consultative process. Mr. Miller explained a public liaison committee had been formed, comprised of all who had applied in response to Regional advertisements. In addition to the standard public consultation process, staff had held information session at the landfill in February on this project, as well as other solid waste projects. Mr. Munro commented that although the consultants and staff had been very good about consulting with area residents, he felt the number of rural residents was not sufficient to make a difference.

Councillor Hill asked staff to comment on Mr. Munro’s assertion that the construction of a leachate pipeline along Route 4 would hold up or affect development in Richmond. Mr. Miller explained capacity would not be taken away from Richmond as the facility was designed to use the capacity available in the existing pipeline over 99% of the time.

Chair Hunter pointed out Richmond had an allocation in the ROP, and the capacity in the Richmond forcemain would allow this capacity to be met. He sought confirmation that nothing in this amendment could take away from this capacity, or the right of Richmond to develop to what had already been approved. Mr. Miller confirmed nothing being discussed would take away from Richmond’s right of capacity. He said Richmond’s problems with infiltration into its sewer system were irrespective of this issue.

Regarding the issue of sandy soil, Mr. Miller explained the analysis for areas adjacent to the Jock River crossing called for double-walled pipe in groundwater areas to ensure the continuous integrity of the crossing under the Jock River. Further to Councillor van den Ham’s reference to another municipality’s control of a pumping system, he explained Monarch Construction operated the pump station under its subdivision agreement.

Mr. Miller clarified for Councillor Beamish that double walling was used because if there were a break under the river, normal excavation processes could not be used. With a double walled pipe, the line could be turned off, the pipeline extracted, and another one could be reinserted. The casing would trap any leaked fluids.

Councillor Beamish then asked Mr. Munro to explain his major concerns regarding a pipeline going into the road bed in front of his property. Mr. Munro said he was worried about contamination from potential leaks. He also expressed concern about putting all the leachate from the West Carleton and Trail Road landfills into one main, which he felt would greatly contaminate areas downstream from where he lived. He said his greatest wish was that the pipeline be installed elsewhere, as he felt rural residents had shouldered such burdens too often in the past.

In light of the first delegation's request to defer the installation of a pipeline altogether, and the second's request to defer selection of a route, Chair Hunter asked Mr. Marc whether the two parts of the recommendation had to stand together, or whether it would be possible to approve the pipeline, but defer the route selection.

Mr. Marc said it was possible to split the items. However, he alerted Committee to the possibility that ROPA 1 could be appealed to the Board, with a subsequent request for a deferral until the pipeline route had been determined.

On the issue of deferral, Mr. Sheflin again referred to the letter from the Ministry of the Environment staff dated 24 June 99, which read in part: *"This Ministry is very concerned that the work proceed on the proposed pipeline as soon as possible. This groundwater contamination problem was originally identified in 1995. In May, 1997, the Ministry and Region of Ottawa-Carleton agreed on an abatement program with a scheduled return to compliance date of 1999. Any work on research programs should not interfere with the timing of the pipeline installation. Recent progress with respect to the contaminated groundwater at the Nepean Landfill site is unsatisfactory and must be resolved without further delay."* Mr. Sheflin felt it was imperative to proceed with a solution, and noted staff's strong recommendation to Committee and Council to do so. Because of this, the Commissioner requested that if any future action were to take place, that no member of staff would be charged because of a delay.

Joseph King, representing the Barrhaven Sewer Action Committee (BSAC) said BSAC remained opposed to a pipeline and believed using hybrids of existing technologies could result in an effluent at Trail Road that could easily be returned to the groundwater. Commenting on the anaerobic digester, Mr. King felt the digester had been proposed to be part of the

Optimization Report and not simply considered within it. He recounted the 9 March 1999 Committee meeting where the off-site conveyance of leachate had been approved, in addition to the staff direction to undertake a route selection process.

He noted that beyond the two staff recommendations, two additional Motions were approved; one by Councillor 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.”*; and one by Councillor 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 the National Research Council in a pilot project to assess new and emerging technologies to treat leachate with a constructed wetland and that the study be forwarded to the Committee considering the Landfill Optimization.”*

Mr. King was concerned that Councillor Legendre’s Motion had not been acted upon. He noted that although the terms of reference for landfill optimization were being reviewed, the report requested by the Councillor had yet to be seen. Mr. King said the recommendations from the 9 Mar 99 Committee meeting were received by Council at its meeting of 14 Apr 99, and that there had been no subsequent Motions to dismiss the aforementioned recommendation. Mr. King also noted at the 28 Apr 99 Council meeting, as part of the reconsideration that occurred with regard to constructing a wetland, comments had been made that the 1996 Dylan report should be reviewed and brought back to Committee, and that information directly tied to the pipeline project be fully reviewed. Mr. King noted the present report only addressed the problem of leachate. He expressed the view that the relationship between staff and Council had resulted in Council being required to move quickly without the full information which had been requested over a year ago. He requested that Council defer ROPA 1 until the fullest information that Council and the community had already paid for was reviewed.

In response, Mr. McNally outlined the occurrences following the 14 Apr 99 Council meeting. He acknowledged the original staff recommendation had been augmented by two additional recommendations at Committee on 9 Mar 99. Mr. McNally noted the issues had been discussed at Council at great length, which resulted in a series of five or six Motions. He said included in those Motions, was a specific Motion to construct a wetland, which was voted on at Council and lost. He explained that staff took this as direction that the wetland issue had been looked at and was no longer going forward. He then noted there had been other amendments to the recommendations, which were reconsidered at Council’s 28 Apr 99 meeting. The matter was subsequently referred back to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Mr. McNally went on to say on 13 Jul 99, the Committee received a report addressing the research project, and at the time, staff suggested to Council that if research was desired, funds had to be identified in the Capital budget. Approximately \$500,000 was identified in the budget, a research project was started, and members of different community organizations who wanted to participate in the research project were invited to do so. He explained that no one who wanted to participate was turned down. He also said this was why staff were back with the update on the pipeline project and the research project, also contained within the present agenda. Mr. McNally noted that unless the full sequence of the events and how they unfolded was studied, a misrepresentation of the original directions might result.

Brian Cummings, a resident in the area of proposed Route 4, said he was against the amendment. He said he preferred on-site optimization, but acknowledged that due to environmental urgencies, this was likely not a viable option at this time. He said he had lived in Munster Hamlet, and recounted how properties had been devalued as a result of Munster Hamlet's failing lagoons. He also noted at one time, working on the Economic Development Committee for the Township of Goulbourn, he had been told it was difficult to get development in the Richmond area. Mr. Cummings felt that common sense indicated leachate going to the R.O. Pickard Centre in the east end, should not be piped westward. He also noted the pipeline in Kanata between Richmond and Glen Cairn was 20 years old, and that a break in this pipe or in fact the mere presence of this pipeline, would lower property values in the area.

Noting there were about 20 residences and a number of different businesses in the area of Route 4, Mr. Cummings wondered why Route 3 had not been chosen. He stated his preference for a route toward the eventual Highway 417/Strandherd Drive development, noting a report coming to Committee in September might provide some answers.

Mr. Cummings then spoke to the issue of sandy soil in reference to the double lined pipe underneath the Jock River. He said if one were to travel along Cambrian Road from Moodie Drive, one would see that the area was completely sandy. He said a break in the pipeline in this vicinity would result in big problems. He also said that to double-pipe this distance would make Route 4 more expensive than Route 3.

The speaker also noted the reference to a peak flow of 13 litres per second. He suggested that in emergency situations, it might take between ten and fifteen minutes to discover a problem, resulting in a potentially large leak, of major concern to residents with nearby wells. Mr. Cummings recommended the option of Route 3, which he felt was a more direct route, even with its accompanying higher cost.

Lois K. Smith reinforced the view that as much treatment as possible should take place on-site to lower the concentration of contaminants in the leachate to a level which would allow almost

pure water to flow into the drainage pipe following treatment. Miss Smith recommended a sealed system with monitoring and other safety capabilities, and suggested the use of a double-walled pipe when going past wells, for a certain distance on either side of the well. She explained these and other views were contained in a detailed letter sent to the Solid Waste Division, which she said she would revise and submit to all members of Council.

Victoria Mason noted Mr. Sheflin had read from a letter from the Ministry of the Environment (contained in the staff report at Annex B), which said the Region should move forward with this. She stated the history of this issue should be reviewed in that it is the Provincial Government that is the “cause of the mess in this area”, as they continued to issue conditional Certificates of Approval to operate the dump, when they knew there was a problem.

With leave of the Chair, Mr. Sheflin responded to a question posed by Ms. Mason with respect to the life expectancy of Trail Road Landfill site. He noted with diversion and other optimization strategies (e.g. mining of the existing area for reuse) which would reduce the total volume going into the landfill site, the potential of the site could be extremely long. He said currently they are projecting the life expectancy at ten years, however, with the optimization it could possibly be longer.

Ms. Mason expressed great concern that the landfill was located adjacent to a floodplain. She said although Nepean has very strict rules regarding building in the floodplain, she found it absurd they would allow a dump to be built in the floodplain. She felt that Route 3, which would tie in with the construction to be undertaken by Monarch, would be the logical choice. She said although it may cost a little more at the outset, it would serve a double purpose and would be more economical than spending \$2.5 million on pipeline to carry only leachate straight to R.O. Pickard Centre. Ms. Mason also expressed concern that the pipeline would go under the Jock River and pointed out the entire area is sand and gravel, a very porous substance. As well, she stated she was worried about Richmond because of the high groundwater levels.

Ms. Mason went on to state that because all residents of the Region will have to pay for this pipeline, the public meetings should have been better advertised and held at more convenient times for the public.

Ms. Mason concluded her remarks by saying she would provide staff with documentation she had concerning the history of the dump. She urged the Region to tell the Province, who she felt was responsible for the problems at the landfill site, that this project would be put off until a proper study is completed.

Nicholas Patterson began by stating he could not understand why the Capital cost of this project was not included in the financial implications. Chair Hunter explained the report did

state it in an indirect way, in the Financial Implications section: “Funds for the proposed wastewater/leachate pipeline are contained in the Capital Budget for Landfill Leachate Management”.

Mr. Patterson, referencing the “Trail Road Landfill Optimization Project” background paper (dated March 2000), noted it said on page 10, that the surface water was in full compliance with the Ministry of the Environment’s surface water objectives and policies and that the quality of the groundwater leaving the Trail Road site is currently and has been, well within compliance of MOE Reasonable Use Guidelines. He questioned why, if these are in compliance, the Region would be considering this project.

The speaker opined this project should be deferred pending the completion of the Barrhaven sewer. He felt the flourishing economy in Ottawa would cause the Barrhaven sewer to be built sooner than expected (i.e. within five years) and it would be capable of handling the entire product proposed to be in this new pipeline. He said this would save the \$3 to \$4 million anticipated cost of the leachate pipeline. Mr. Patterson felt it was the failure to act on these kinds of deferrals and potential savings, that contribute to the terrible tax situation that exists in Ottawa-Carleton.

Chair Hunter pointed out that both Mr. Pyper and Mr. Patterson had raised a concern that there was a contradiction about the groundwater. He stated once the delegations were finished, he would want an explanation from staff concerning this contradiction.

D. A. Moodie stated he was not overly concerned about the design of sewers under the Jock River or even the exact location of the sewer. He said with modern technology, he believed the sewers would be reasonably well built and safe. However, he said he was very much concerned about the procedure. He noted there were three proposed routes for the pipeline and only after strong objections were received concerning these routes did Route 4 enter into the picture. Mr. Moodie said he did not believe the same attention, that was given to the first three routes, was given to Route 4 by the engineers.

The speaker noted Route 4 would come down under the Jock River to Eagleson Road, and down Eagleson Road to the Glencairn pumping station, where it is all old sewer. Mr. Moodie advised that at a meeting of the Richmond Structural Committee, held a few weeks earlier, residents expressed great concern about this route and the potential for breakage in the old sewers and resulting pollution. He noted the proposal included no provision for repairing the old sewer or for putting in double sewers at crossings.

Mr. Moodie then had questions concerning a statement contained in the Amendment that said connections to the wastewater/leachate pipeline, other than from the Trail Road facility and the Nepean landfill site, would not be permitted.

At Chair Hunter's request, Mr. Tunnacliffe responded this passage was contained in the Amendment itself and it is saying it is Council's policy that this pipeline will only be used to transfer the wastewater and leachate from Trail Road to the connection with the forcemain at Eagleson. There will be no other connections permitted.

Chair Hunter pointed out this would be a forcemain and it is very difficult and expensive to hook into a forcemain in mid-section. Mr. Sheflin advised it would be "liquid under pressure", which means something of a higher pressure could be injected into it, but one could not connect into the section from Trail Road to where it connects to the sewer line at Eagleson and Hazeldean.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Moodie advised that, should Route 4 be approved, Nepean rural residents would appeal it to the Ontario Municipal Board, mainly because it was not part of the initial study. He stated he supported the deferral of this matter pending further study.

Councillor Legendre asked for staff comment with respect to Mr. Moodie's statement that Route 4 "had come in rather late in the day". Mr. Miller advised the route selection process "took off with vigour" in February, 2000 and Route 4 had been part of the process, since it was tabled at a public meeting held on 26 February 2000.

Councillor Legendre then asked staff to address Mr. Moodie's concern about a modern, pressure pipeline going into an older system. Mr. McCartney stated he assumed Mr. Moodie was referring to the existing Richmond Forcemain, which was installed approximately twenty-five years ago. He said some of the valving needs maintenance work but the pipeline itself is in good condition and its integrity is not in question. He confirmed the material used in that pipeline was similar to the pipe to be used in the proposed pipeline (i.e. plastic pipe). He also added an expert had examined the pipe and the constituents of the leachate and gave the opinion there would not be a problem.

At Chair Hunter's request, Mr. Sheflin then addressed the concern raised by two previous speakers with respect to the perceived contradiction concerning the groundwater and surface water. Mr. Sheflin stated he believed the confusion was as a result of there being two sites. The Nepean landfill site is a completed site which does not have a bottom liner and there is groundwater contamination. The Region has purchased some property around the site to contain the groundwater contamination but the contamination must be addressed. Mr. Sheflin said he felt the presenters were referring to the active site which does not have a groundwater or a surface water problem but it does have leachate.

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

Chair Hunter noted he had received three motions for consideration. The first was from Councillor Hill to defer consideration of the route selection (i.e. recommendation 2) until the City of Nepean sewer servicing study is available (expected in September, 2000). The second motion was from Councillor Hume to defer the item (both recommendations 1 and 2) so the Citizens Review Committee and interested parties could meet with Regional staff to resolve the issue of anaerobic digestion pretreatment of leachate. The third motion, from Councillor Hill, was to approve Route 3 as the pipeline route. Councillor Hill noted this motion was to be considered if her motion for deferral failed.

Chair Hunter indicated Councillor Hume's motion would be dealt with first. If that failed, then Councillor Hill's motion for deferral would be dealt with and failing approval of that motion, finally Councillor Hill's motion to approve Route 3 would be considered.

Speaking to his motion, Councillor Hume noted the first delegation spoke of the potential of anaerobic digestion pretreatment, which the Councillor believed had merit. He said the Committee had not heard whether the digester has a role to play in the ultimate solution of the leachate problem and he felt it warranted examination before a final decision on the route selection for the pipeline was made.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. McNally confirmed an anaerobic digester could potentially improve the quality of the water leaving the site but it would not reduce the quantity of water and so trucking or some other way of removing the fluid would still be required. Further, anaerobic digestion would remove the carbon based contaminants but it would not remove other contaminants (e.g. metallic contaminants).

Councillor Hume stated he wanted to make it clear to the Committee, that he was not proposing anaerobic digestion as a replacement for the pipeline but rather that it be part of the solution. He expressed concern that if Committee and Council were to approve the pipeline at this stage, anaerobic digestion would be forgotten about. He said the Committee did not currently have sufficient information to direct staff to include anaerobic digestion as part of the solution but he felt if the two sides sat down to resolve the issue of how anaerobic digestion would fit into the process, it would not take long. He suggested the matter could be back to Committee at its next meeting of 8 August.

Councillor Legendre noted that anaerobic digestion could remove carbon-based contaminants, but would be of little use for the removal of elements such as heavy metals. Mr. McNally confirmed this was correct. He also confirmed it had been staff's belief since the project

commenced, that although anaerobic digestion could improve the situation on-site, the need for a pipeline would still exist.

Councillor Hume wanted assurance that when the project went forward and was implemented, the framework to allow for anaerobic digestion to fit into the pipeline process would still exist. He warned that if this was not assured in advance, the pipeline would be built and anaerobic digestion would subsequently be forgotten. He proposed that staff meet with concerned parties and return to Committee with an assurance that anaerobic digestion could either be incorporated now or in the near future, but ultimately that it would form part of the solution. The Councillor felt Committee could possibly receive information in this regard by the Committee's 8 Aug 2000 meeting.

Councillor Stewart said she did not oppose an anaerobic digester, but did not feel the amendment and preferred solution should be deferred while deciding how to go about the process. She believed Committee should pick the route, and said she was inclined to support Councillor Hill's amendment to choose Route 3 over Route 4. She said she believed Route 4 was a less logical choice than Route 3, and even more so after listening to Mr. Munro's presentation. Councillor Stewart said it was sometimes easier to do the wrong thing to people who had less of a voice or presence, but to do so did not make it right. She said she would support Councillor Hill's amendment, and urged Committee to defeat the Motions for deferral.

Mr. Sheflin suggested if it was Committee's intent to look at anaerobic digestion outside of optimization, this should be added to the research project.

Councillor van den Ham said he too was leaning towards supporting Route 3 and noted a review of the report indicated that in some instances, there were minute differences between Routes 3 and 4, some of which he felt were questionable. However, in light of the need for a substantial reason for Committee to choose an alternate route, he asked for a legal opinion regarding potential problems arising from such a decision.

Mr. Marc suggested the second Recommendation was different in nature from those normally received from staff. He outlined that normally, the recommendations follow from process or items that have been identified by staff, or process or subject that Regional Council has asked for recommendations on. These are brought forward and can be adopted or amended. However, in this instance, the recommendation flows from the EA process, which is not part of Council's process. Mr. Marc explained the EA process is one established under the *Environmental Assessment Act*, and approved by the Province. As part of this process, there are steps that must be followed, criteria that must be established, and the various routes are identified against those criteria.

Mr. Marc said, although the Committee was not bound to accept the results of the process, in his view, it was not appropriate for Committee to simply opt for Route 3 as opposed to Route 4. He said if Committee and Council were inclined to take this approach, it was necessary to indicate their reasons for deviating from the result of the EA process (e.g. problems in the way certain criteria were weighted, etc.). Mr. Marc said this was not something that was often necessary for Committee and Council to do, but in order to have a result that could be taken to the Ministry and shown to have been a valid process and properly analyzed, he believed this was necessary.

Chair Hunter asked if some of the points Councillor van den Ham had noted when referring to the weighting of certain criteria, hydraulics, etc., in support of Councillor Hill's Motion would suffice to this end. Mr. Marc suggested if this was the path Committee wished to follow, it would be prudent to put this into writing.

Councillor van den Ham said he supported Route 3 and was prepared to draft appropriate wording to back his view. He pointed out Route 4 had been preferred environmentally because only 0.08 of a hectare (ha) had been disturbed as opposed to 0.3 ha in Route 3. He felt the difference was minuscule, making the environmental preference ridiculous.

Councillor van den Ham also had questions with regard to the Planned Land Use (PLU). He said he understood Route 4 would affect 12 residences while Route 3 seemingly affected none. He said he appreciated the necessity to consider future land use, but he disagreed with the figures being used, and felt it was more important to deal with people currently living in the area. The Councillor suggested that people moving in at a future date could be made aware of the pipeline's presence.

Mr. Marc suggested if it was Committee's intent to take the time to articulate its reasons and postpone the decision to Council, Committee might simply decline to make a recommendation with respect to Item 2 at this point, and defer Recommendation 2 to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Miller suggested staff could arrange a meeting between Councillor van den Ham, other interested Councillors and the team that had put the report together in order to provide the analysis required to form a Motion that would reflect support for Councillor van den Ham's preferred route.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen referred to a recommendation contained within a Motion approved by the Committee at its meeting of 9 Jun 99, that read, "*That staff be directed to include the proposal from the Citizens Review Committee (anaerobic digester and poplar forest capping) in their consideration of options for optimization of the Trail Road*

Landfill site.” She asked whether these specific words had been used in the terms of reference for the Optimization Study.

Mr. McNally explained the draft terms of reference at this point did not contain these words, but said he had spoken with the consultant to ask that they be included. Mr. McNally said he was assured they would be included in the final revision, along with other comments received for consideration before the terms of reference are finalized. He explained that at this point, the department has been circulating a draft EA terms of reference, the main purpose of which is to seek more air space. He noted the question of how to deal with leachate, anaerobic digestion, etc., are operational issues to be dealt with based on the assumption staff are successful in getting the air space. He said a meeting between the Region’s consultants and the CRC had been held to explain this issue, and Mr. McNally had been working under the impression that this had been completely understood. He assured Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen staff would clarify the wording in the final terms of reference.

For the record, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen recounted the history of the 9 Jun 99 Motion. She said the Motion had been drafted partly by herself, but moved by Councillor Munter on her behalf. She explained she wanted Committee and staff to understand what her desire was at that time and what she believed was the direction given.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen explained the direction had been that anaerobic digestion be studied not just for the pre-treatment for leachate and leachate management, but also for landfill optimization. She believed an anaerobic digestion system could be used to “mine” Cells One and Two of the landfill as part of an optimization of these cells. She acknowledged these were notions at present, but felt they need to be evaluated in the optimization of the landfill. The Councillor felt that unless this was specified in the terms of reference, anaerobic digestion would not be considered as a part of optimization.

The Councillor noted the City of Guelph was also examining the potential benefits of anaerobic digestion and she felt the Region should be studying this process for possible future use at the landfill and as a part of the optimization process. She asked for assurance this would be in the terms of reference, and stated she expected to see these results in the optimization report.

Mr. McNally suggested the best way to resolve this issue would be for staff to arrange a meeting with the consultant and Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen to address her concerns. He noted the report had not been finalized, and that only a *draft* terms of reference had been circulated. He said the commitment had been made to include these directions in the *finalized* terms of reference.

As Councillor Hume's Motion spoke to deferral, Chair Hunter felt it would be prudent to discuss this matter prior to consideration of questions regarding route selection.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen felt there were merits in supporting deferral because of a number of ongoing studies, such as the City of Nepean's sewer servicing study, and the Corel Area Study, which might help determine the potential for the advancement of Highway 416 and Strandherd Drive in terms of a need for serviced land to support economic growth. She suggested a delay until September was not significant, and that all information should be considered prior to making a decision on the route.

Chair Hunter urged Committee not to support the deferral. He pointed out the evidence showed that even if the anaerobic digestion pre-treatment of leachate took place, there would still be a need for a pipeline. He further noted the MOE directions to proceed with work on a pipeline to deal with groundwater that would not be satisfactorily treated with anaerobic digestion. The Chair reminded members of Councillor Legendre's reference to substances in leachate that would not be treated by the anaerobic digestion process. He said it would never be satisfactory to discharge such substances into surface waters, a further illustration of the need for a pipeline. Chair Hunter said this did not mean the issue of anaerobic digestion should not be discussed. He said the CRC had a right to meet with staff and with interested Councillors with a view to resolving this issue. However, he did not feel this was cause for deferral of these particular recommendations.

Committee then considered the following Motion:

Moved by P. Hume.

That Recommendations 1 and 2, Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 1 be deferred to allow opportunity for the CRC and interested parties to meet with Regional staff to resolve the issue of anaerobic digestion pre-treatment of leachate.

LOST

NAYS: M. Bellemare, B. Hill, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, W. Stewart and
R. van den Ham.....6.

YEAS: P. Hume.....1

The Committee then turned their attention to Councillor Hill's motion for deferral.

Councillor Stewart urged Committee to turn down this Motion for deferral as well, and to proceed with Councillor Hill's Motion regarding the approval of Route 3. She said she would

like Committee to forward the latter Motion to Council, basing the decision on the following reasons, contained within the report:

- Fewer number of wells within the likely zone of influence than along Route 4;
- Route 4 pipeline intersects the longest section of permeable sands, whereas Route 3 intersects only a short section;
- Less impact on agricultural operations;
- Less impact on property values (two dwellings along Route 3 vs. eight dwellings along Route 4);
- Less impact on business activity (no accesses crossed along Route 3, vs. three crossed along Route 4; no businesses within 100 metres of Route 3, vs. three businesses within 100 metres of Route 4);
- Health and safety - Route 3 impacts no dwellings, whereas Route 4 impacts nine dwellings.

Councillor Stewart felt these reasons would be sufficient to support a rejection of Route 4 in favour of Route 3. She noted this choice would result in less habitat disruption and less environmental impact.

Councillor Legendre noted Councillor Hill's Motion for deferral asked that Committee await a servicing study from Nepean. He noted this was only a *study*, and asked if it was known when the actual *pipeline* would be installed. Mr. Miller explained the servicing study would look at sanitary sewer servicing for the lands in the Cedarview Road / Strandherd Drive area south of Fallowfield Road. He said Nepean was studying the matter from an interim servicing point of view for the area, pending the final sewer system which was expected to be constructed several years hence. He said this was why staff were recommending proceeding with the selection of a route.

Councillor Legendre said he failed to see the logic of deferring a Committee decision to await the Nepean study, and said he would not support deferral.

Chair Hunter pointed out the study was looking at a slightly shorter alignment, and would use existing excess capacity through an existing part of Barrhaven. He suggested other Barrhaven neighbourhoods might then be addressing Committee in a fashion similar to that of Mr. King. The Chair noted the advantage of either Routes 3 or 4 was that they traversed *relatively* virgin territory as far as housing developments.

Committee then considered the Motion from Councillor Hill.

Moved by B. Hill

That the pipeline route selection (Recommendation No. 2 of the report) be deferred until the City of Nepean Sewer Servicing Study is available (which is expected in September of 2000), outlining flow capacity in the Barrhaven sewer system.

LOST

NAYS: M. Bellemare, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham.....5
YEAS: B. Hill and P. Hume.....2

Chair Hunter then read the remaining Motion from Councillor Hill:

That Committee recommend that Council approve pipeline route selection Route 3 as the preferred location for a pipeline to convey leachate from Trail Road Waste Facility and contaminated groundwater from Nepean Landfill Site to the R.O. Pickard Environmental Centre for treatment and disposal.

The Chair noted that legal counsel had recommended against putting forward a Motion without substantive reasoning.

Councillor Legendre asked Mr. Marc to explain his original suggestion that Committee decline to make a recommendation to Council regarding the selection of a route, and have the matter debated at Council. He said he could see no advantage of doing so, and felt that any decision made at Committee could be changed at Council. Mr. Marc said he had assumed Committee members might want to take time to articulate their reasons, and thus it would be appropriate to postpone the decision to Council. He said that if Committee felt it was in a position to mention its reasons now, and wished to choose Route No. 3 for clearly defined reasons, his concerns were fully addressed.

Councillor Hill accepted Councillor Stewart's suggested wording as a friendly amendment.

Councillor Stewart noted more reasons could be added by the time the matter came before Council after a more thorough analysis, and she urged fellow Committee members to support the Motion.

Councillor Legendre indicated he would not support the Motion. However, he said he would take up staff's offer of a briefing on the route selection process. He said he would support the staff recommendation, but indicated that his vote at Council might change, depending on the information presented at the briefing. He urged other Committee members to do the same.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked Committee to support the selection of Route 3. She felt the community's environmental concerns regarding present and future impacts spoke to Route 3 as the best option. The Councillor noted this was not a perfect solution, but she said the debate had been going on long enough, and it was time to try to resolve the decades-old problem regarding the landfill and its associated environmental impacts. She said the pipeline would be a solution for today, and the Landfill Optimization report would help to identify future solutions. In closing, she said she believed Committee should move forward with a recommendation and proceed with the project.

Councillor Bellemare said that barring compelling reasons to change his mind on the matter, he would support the staff recommendation of Route 4 as the preferred option. He noted a briefing might help to better illustrate the differences between Routes 3 and 4. He cited contradictory information and insufficient detail in the report as the basis of his support for the staff recommendation, along with legal counsel's explanation that Committee needed a good rationale for changing the recommended route.

There being no further discussion, the Committee then considered the first part of the staff recommendation.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council:

- 1. Subject to a public meeting, enact a By-law to adopt Regional Official Plan Amendment 1 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached in Annex 'A';**

CARRIED

(P. Hume dissented)

Committee then considered the following recommendation as a substitution to the original staff recommendation:

- 2. Approve pipeline route selection (Route 3) as the preferred location for a pipeline to convey leachate from Trail Road Waste Facility and contaminated groundwater from Nepean Landfill Site to the R.O. Pickard Environmental Centre for treatment and disposal, for the following reasons:**

- Fewer number of wells within the likely zone of influence than along Route 4;**
- Route 4 pipeline intersects the longest section of permeable sands, whereas Route 3 intersects only a short section;**
- Less impact on agricultural operations;**

- Less impact on property values (two dwellings along Route 3 vs. eight dwellings along Route 4);
- Less impact on business activity (no accesses crossed along Route 3, vs. three crossed along Route 4; no businesses within 100 metres of Route 3, vs. three businesses within 100 metres of Route 4);
- Health and safety - Route 3 impacts no dwellings, whereas Route 4 impacts nine dwellings.

CARRIED

YEAS: B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham.....5
NAYS M. Bellemare and J. Legendre.....2

Committee then approved the staff recommendations, as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council:

1. Having held a public meeting, enact a by-law to adopt Regional Official Plan Amendment 1 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached in Annex 'A';
2. Approve pipeline route selection (Route 3) as the preferred location for a pipeline to convey leachate from Trail Road Waste Facility and contaminated groundwater from Nepean Landfill Site to the R.O. Pickard Environmental Centre for treatment and disposal, for the following reasons :
 - Fewer number of wells within the likely zone of influence than along Route 4;
 - Route 4 pipeline intersects the longest section of permeable sands, whereas Route 3 intersects only a short section;
 - Less impact on agricultural operations;
 - Less impact on property values (two dwellings along Route 3 vs. eight dwellings along Route 4);
 - Less impact on business activity (no accesses crossed along Route 3, vs. three crossed along Route 4; no businesses within 100 metres of Route 3, vs. three businesses within 100 metres of Route 4);
 - Health and safety - Route 3 impacts no dwellings, whereas Route 4 impacts nine dwellings.

CARRIED as amended

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

3. TRAIL ROAD LANDFILL SITE -
LEACHATE PRE-TREATMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM
- Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and
Transportation Department report dated 23 June 2000

Lois K. Smith stated as much pre-treatment as possible should be used, on not only the leachate but the landfill itself. She said she was aware that a dedicated wetland to receive organic waste could not operate well in the winter. However, she suggested a course of indoor, temperature-regulated year-round treatment using continuous-flow tubes containing algae with the desired properties for removing unwanted elements such as heavy metals. This would leave essentially clean water once the algae were filtered out.

Miss Smith advised that one of the problems of putting leachate into the regular biosolid waste stream was the increased opportunity of building up heavy metals when disposing of biosolids. She cited reports of European studies which said biosolid usage on farmland had ceased because of a 25 year buildup in heavy metals. She said this would lead to a loss in the value of biosolids which could otherwise be retained, provided there was adequate pre-treatment to remove the heavy metals to begin with. Miss Smith said she was willing to do further research to provide staff with the names of the appropriate strains of algae.

Chair Hunter informed Miss Smith she was speaking to a level of detail that Committee was not dealing with at the moment. He informed her of a technical advisory committee that would be considering proposals, experiments, etc. The report indicated "*The technical advisory committee is composed of members of the public, and reflects their points of view. All members of the public who expressed interest in participating in this project have been included on the technical advisory committee.*" He found it regrettable Miss Smith had not applied for membership on the technical advisory committee.

Miss Smith said she had not done so due to prior commitments, and cited a lack of transportation, which would be a detriment to her ability to participate.

Chair Hunter assured Miss Smith her comments had been recorded and would be forwarded to the technical advisory committee for consideration. He said he would further discuss the possibility of her participation on the committee.

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

RECEIVED

PLANNING ITEMS

4. TOWNSHIP OF OSGOODE OFFICIAL PLAN
AMENDMENT NO. 4 - CRAIG, VILLAGE OF OSGOODE
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 14 June 2000

Councillor Legendre stated he was disappointed to see that staff were recommending approval of this amendment and noted there was no rationale for doing so provided in the report. He said although the report states staff do not identify a land use compatibility issue, it also states it does not satisfy the Provincial Policy Statement. He said in view of this information and the fact there are petitions against this amendment, he wondered why staff were recommending approval of it.

With regard to the Provincial Policy Statement, Nigel Brereton, Senior Project Manager, Development Approvals Division, advised the Statement leads off by saying that expansions of settlements, either urban or rural, shall only occur where needed. He said if this were taken at face value, then staff would recommend that the amendment be turned down because there are 82 hectares of residential land for development in the Village of Osgoode. However, another section of the Provincial Policy Statement also states that any expansion should ensure such things as efficient use of existing infrastructure, avoid unnecessary expansion of new infrastructure and costs, ensure natural resources are protected and ensure there can be appropriate sewage and water systems. Mr. Brereton stated when staff looked at those points individually (as set out in the staff report on pages 32 and 33 of the Agenda), they concluded there was not a problem. On that basis, they felt the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement could in fact be met by this amendment. Mr. Brereton stated staff feel comfortable with the conclusion they reached in this instance.

Councillor Legendre then had questions with respect to the LEAR evaluation of the land. He noted it had received a score of 55 and sought confirmation that this meant it was not very good agricultural land. Mr. Brereton advised the LEAR score was as a result of a combination of land and soil capability. He noted the subject property was basically a forestry plantation with Class 4 soil.

Councillor Legendre referring to the petition opposing the subdivision, noted it stated there was no need at this time for the addition of any residential lots in the market as there are approximately 45 lots still remaining in the Fairfield Estates. The Councillor asked, in terms of the lots that are to be developed in this area if there was any concern with respect to servicing

capacity. Mr. Brereton advised the development is on private services and these lots will have to be the subject of a hydrogeology and terrain analysis study before they can proceed. This will ensure there will be no negative impacts on the existing lots in the registered subdivision to the south. He confirmed all houses would have their own well, which is normal in the rural area.

Councillor Legendre asked for staff comment with respect to the last portion of the letter that he read regarding priority being given to develop Phase 3 of Fairfield Estates so that residents on north street of Main Street will have access to parkland that is planned. Mr. Brereton advised the entire Fairfield Subdivision including Phase 3 is registered. The letter is referring to when the houses are constructed, the park will be put in place. Mr. Brereton advised there were different landowners for the subdivisions.

Councillor Legendre asked, in view of the rationale staff is putting forward, that these are all private services, what prevents landowners all around the village from seeking an amendment to add land for residential development. Mr. Brereton advised each application would be put through the same series of tests and if it met the requirements (e.g. poor agricultural land, etc.), then it would be approved.

The Committee then approved the staff recommendation.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve Amendment No. 4 to the Township of Osgoode Official Plan as per the Approval Page attached as Annex I.

CARRIED

5. **CARLSBAD SPRINGS WATER SUPPLY**
FARMERS WAY - FINANCING OPTIONS

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's, Acting
Finance Commissioner's, Acting Regional Solicitor's and Environment and
Transportation Commissioner's joint report dated 4 July 2000

Councillor van den Ham indicated he did not have a problem with the spirit of the item however he did have questions. Referring to recommendation 9, "that staff be directed to make all efforts to recover the Regional contribution from pending infrastructure program", he asked if this meant staff would pursue other higher levels of government funding programs. Mr. Miller advised that the Provincial government has in the past, had an active program to help with water and sewer projects. They have backed off that program recently in the last two or three years and it has been Council policy in previous communal water installations in the rural area, to use that funding to support the program. He said staff view this as an opportunity to raise the profile of water and sewer issues in the rural area and also feel the Region should be consistent with

what has happened in the past regarding funding. He said staff recognize this is not at the same level of the funding support the Province has given in other programs but they thought it appropriate to make this recommendation.

Councillor van den Ham stated he understood there may be other programs coming from the Federal Government and he wanted to ensure the Region accesses those programs.

The Councillor then sought clarification with respect to the numbers presented on page 43. He noted there is total of \$155,000 for the fifteen original lots and it is recommended that they pay up to a maximum of \$9,000 each. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, explained staff are recommending that the residents pay whatever the final cost generates on the basis of frontage, with one exception. For the lot with the 340 metre frontage, staff are recommending that particular lot be capped at \$9,000 through the provision of a grant of \$57,300.

The Councillor had questions with respect to the improvement to Eighth Line Road. Mr. Marc advised in that instance, the homeowners will pay \$36,000 and the net cost to the Region is about \$80,000 (not a grant but a net cost to the Region).

Councillor van den Ham advised he was supportive of the recommendations. He said he felt this was the right thing to do as there are water problems and he agreed the Region should put forward some money, with best efforts to recoup.

At Chair Hunter's request Mr. Marc provided Committee with an update on the consultation he had with the owners along the proposed extension of Farmers Way. He advised Mr. Gauthier (one of the owners along the extension of Farmers Way) was at the last meeting and he was in support of it. Mr. Marc attempted to telephone the other owners of the three lots in question on Farmers Way and was able to inform two of them of what was coming forward and that the cost would be \$9,000. He indicated he invited them to call either himself or Councillor Beamish and they had not. The fourth owner is completely unaware of what is going on. He has a vacant lot on the affected portion of Farmers Way but he is out of the country until next Monday (17 July 2000).

Councillor van den Ham indicated he was moving the following motion on behalf of Councillor Beamish, who had to leave the meeting early.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That the third recommendation be amended to read:

3. That the grant be conditional upon the portion of the local improvement charge equivalent to the grant being paid by that owner as a lump sum;

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations, as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the following:

1. That an extension of Carlsbad Alternative Standards Water Supply System be constructed along Farmers Way from Ninth Line Road to Eighth Line Road;
2. That with respect to the lot having frontage of 340 metres in the local improvement area, a grant be provided to the owner to the extent that the local improvement charges for this lot is in excess of \$9,000;
3. That the grant be conditional upon the portion of the local improvement charge equivalent to the grant being paid by that owner as a lump sum;
4. That capital authority of \$300,000 be established for the project with a net Regional requirement not to exceed \$160,000;
5. That debenture authority in the amount of \$300,000 be established;
6. That with respect to the extension of the water service from the end of the local improvement area to Eighth Line Road, a charge be imposed under the *Municipal Act*, section 221 of \$9,000 per lot fronting on Farmers Way;
7. That the owners in the local improvement area and those in the area subject to the *Municipal Act*, section 221 charge have the option of paying the amount owing as a lump sum or over a period of 20 years;
8. That the owners in the local improvement area and the owners subject to the *Municipal Act*, section 221 charge who amortise their charges be eligible to commute such charges based upon the difference between the rate of interest payable on the debentures issued for the project and the rate of interest being earned by the Region/new City of Ottawa at the time of the application for commutation; and,

- 9. That staff be directed to make all efforts to recover the Regional contribution for the extension of the water main north of the local improvement area from the pending infrastructure financing program.**

CARRIED as amended

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Council be requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider this item at its meeting of 12 July 2000.

CARRIED

6. D. McGEE CONSTRUCTION CO. LTD. - PROPOSED
TEMPORARY USE ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT -
PART OF PART 1, 5R-2813, CONCESSION 11, LOTS 29 AND 30
CITY OF KANATA
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 26 June 2000

Don Herweyer, Senior Project Manager, Development Approvals Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, provided Committee with a brief summary of the report.

Murray Chown, Novatech Engineering, representing Kevin and Lisa Haime. Mr. Chown advised his clients operate a driving range and have effectively been given their "eviction notice" on their present site. His clients are seeking a site where they can open in the spring of 2001 and this would require that they are able to acquire the site and carry out the necessary grading, drainage and landscaping work required for the driving range. Mr. Chown noted the appeal period on the zoning by-law expires in a couple of weeks and because of the urgency of this matter, he had asked staff to bring it before the Committee so it could be dealt with within the appeal period rather than the normal process where staff appeal and at a later date, Committee confirms the position of staff. He indicated he was before the Committee to ask them to amend the recommendation so that staff not appeal the zoning by-law amendment.

Mr. Chown indicated he had distributed material to the Committee in support of this amendment. He noted the Regional Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statements are intended to protect the long term viability of agricultural resource lands for agricultural production. He

felt his client's intended use of the property as a driving range would not violate the goals and objectives of the ROP.

He noted in the staff report there was some discussion as to what is temporary in dealing with a driving range. He explained most of a driving range is just a field of grass and other aspects of the operation (e.g. parking facilities, temporary structures, etc.) would not be atypical to other uses that are allowed in an agricultural resource area (e.g. a pick-your-own strawberry operation). Mr. Chown went on to say that any use of rural agricultural land is going to require a well and/or a septic system. He pointed out Kanata Council unanimously supported the request for a temporary use by-law and did not impose any conditions with respect to septic systems and wells. He noted all of these facilities (i.e. well, septic system, parking lot or temporary structure) could be removed from the site and the site could be restored to its agricultural potential.

Mr. Chown then addressed the issue of conformity. He noted there are no policies in the Regional Official Plan that address temporary use by-laws, and therefore this was not at issue. He felt the proposed use of the land did not violate the goals and objectives of the Regional Official Plan, as they merely wanted to "grow grass", not subdivide or build permanent structures.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Chown asked that the Committee modify the staff recommendation to read that Council direct staff not to appeal the zoning amendment.

Chair Hunter questioned if there was anywhere else in that immediate market area the driving range could locate that Regional staff would not object to.

Mr. Chown noted that Regional staff had suggested there were significant areas of general rural land in Kanata and he could not deny that. However, he said there were a couple of factors that had led to his clients considering this property. Firstly, any land that falls within the urban area boundaries of the City of Kanata needs to be discounted as it is simply unaffordable to locate a driving range on fully serviced, urban land. In terms of General Rural versus agricultural resource land, Mr. Chown pointed out that such land is General Rural for a reason, because there is rock, wetland, swamp, etc. He said good agricultural land with wide open fields is required for a driving range. In the City of Kanata, particularly south of Highway 417 (which is where the current business is located) virtually all of the land (except the land that is the subject of the Corel Centre study), outside the urban area is agricultural resource. Mr. Chown said, in terms of the market that his clients are in and wish to stay in, there are no other options.

Chair Hunter indicated he had received a motion from Councillor Stewart that Council direct staff not to appeal the zoning by-law amendment.

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would be supporting Councillor Stewart's motion. As he felt this was a reasonable request. However, he noted facilities such as this start out as a temporary use and are still there many years later. He asked if Mr. Chown was at liberty to disclose his client's future plans with regard to this enterprise. Mr. Chown said it was reasonable to expect that at the very least, his clients would be looking for an extension on the temporary use in three years time. He said it was likely, within that time they would likely seek the appropriate official plan amendment that staff referred to, if they have any intention of making this use more permanent.

The Committee then considered Councillor Stewart's motion.

Moved by W. Stewart

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council direct staff not to appeal the above noted zoning by-law amendment.

CARRIED as amended

Mr. Chown relayed to the Committee the urgent nature of this matter and Councillor Stewart agreed to put forward a motion asking Council to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider this matter at its meeting of 12 July 2000.

Moved by W. Stewart

That Council be requested to waive the rules of procedure to consider this item at their meeting of 12 July 2000.

CARRIED

7. **RENAMING THE OLD ALIGNMENT OF STAGECOACH ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 25) - TOWNSHIP OF OSGOODE**
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 22 June 2000

That the Planning and Environment Committee (acting as the Regional Street Name Committee) recommend that Council approve the following proposed street name:

- 1. That the old alignment of Stagecoach Road (Regional Road 25) north of Dalmeny Road (Regional Road 4) in the Township of Osgoode be renamed “Old Stagecoach Road”.**

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Councillor Hill inquired as to the status of the shared use agreement with Goulbourn Township for the Richmond Lagoons.

Mr. Marc stated he had been advised by Councillor Hill that this inquiry would be coming forward and he indicated a report would be brought to Committee on this issue.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR