

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

13 FEBRUARY 1996

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

Members: D. Beamish, P. Clark, A. Cullen, B. Hill, P. Hume, A. Munter, W. Stewart and  
R. van den Ham

REGRETS: J. Legendre

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 23 January 1996.**

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

1. Regional Solid Waste Collection Tender Contract Awards  
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 26 Jan 96

Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division provided the Committee with an overview of the staff report.

Nadine Gauthier, owner of Exel Environmental, advised the Committee her company has been providing waste collection and curbside recycling in the City of Vanier for the last four years. She noted that Exel has been able to provide a service that she is proud of. She stated the company is growing and noted other contracts undertaken in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector include the House of Commons, Public Works and the National Research Council.

Ms. Gauthier expressed appreciation for the staff recommendation and stated she sees it as a great opportunity; however, she would prefer the contract be awarded for five years.

Exel has been working effectively with the RMOC since January to ensure the transition of collection responsibilities from the local municipality to the Region went unnoticed. The speaker noted the importance of educating householders in order to reduce waste generation and looks forward to working with the Region to make this possible. She assured the Committee the necessary equipment would be purchased by the deadline.

Ms. Gauthier provided the Committee with information about herself, noting she has had hands-on experience working on the collection trucks. Further, all managers in the company are required to have an understanding of all positions in the company (i.e. driver, loader, etc.)

Exel has linked up with Waste Recycling Inc.(WRI) in order to process the recycling material in an efficient manner. Exel, in association with WRI, is fully capable of handling Zone C and noted that this arrangement is in the best interest of the Region economically and will benefit the taxpayers.

Councillor Hunter asked Ms. Gauthier why she favoured a five year contract. She replied five years would provide more time for amortization of the equipment. As well, the longer duration would allow the public to have a better knowledge of the hauler.

Peter McMann, President, Waste Recycling Inc.(WRI), advised he has been in the recycling business for over 17 years during which time he has seen many changes in attitudes towards recycling. He noted now more than ever solid waste diversion is a win-win reality. Mr. McMann provided the Committee with background on his experience in the waste recycling industry, noting he has held senior management positions with some of the largest haulers, recycling processors and paper mills across North America.

WRI began in Ottawa in 1993 as the area's most advanced recycling and processing facility and is staffed by 27 full time employees. The facility processes over 2000 tonnes of recyclable material per month, collected from the ICI sectors and some community based curbside programs. WRI is committed to keeping all recyclables out of the landfill; in order to achieve this mandate, the company continues to expand the types of materials that can be diverted, with emphasis placed on researching new markets.

Mr. McMann noted approximately 71% of the material collected through the expanded blue box program will be fibre based material. WRI has recently entered into a partnership with Paperboard Industry Corporation part of a large network of recycling facilities including pulping mills and paper converting plants. As a result of this partnership, WRI can offer reliable markets for a wide range of recoverable materials. As an example of WRI's commitment to marketing development, over \$8 million has been invested in Paperboard recently to expand their technology to process low grades of paper fibre.

WRI is owned privately by three parties, Mr. McMann, Metro Waste Paper Toronto and Paperboard Industries Corporation. WRI processes all of the grades of paper proposed in the expanded blue box program as well as glass, many grades of plastic, tin, aluminium and textiles. WRI is about to join forces with their associate company, Recuperation Cascade, and move into a new facility equipped with the most modern sorting and bailing equipment available on the market.

Mr. McMann listed a number of companies that WRI is involved with, including Exel Environmental. He noted that since May, 1994 WRI has held monthly paper depots at various locations in the city and has donated its share of the revenues (totalling \$3,600) to various charitable organizations in the RMOC. Mr. McMann noted that a number of local politicians volunteer their time at these depots and listed Councillor Hume among them.

In conclusion, Mr. McCann suggested the Committee consider a five year bi-weekly collection contract for efficiency. He stated that WRI, together with Exel Environmental and Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI) could change the face of waste collection and recycling for the Region.

Councillor Hume noted that Mr. McMann favoured a five year, bi-weekly collection contract, however, staff is concerned that bi-weekly collection will result in leakage into the waste stream. The Councillor asked for Mr. McMann's opinion on this. Mr. McMann felt the information available on leakage is not very conclusive. After consulting with many people in the industry, he believes an efficient process would prevent leakage. As to how homeowners could handle the expanded blue box materials, Mr. McMann noted that in many cases, even with bi-weekly collection, the blue boxes are not full; however, larger blue boxes are available should they be required.

Wayne Beaudoin, Laidlaw, expressed his pleasure that Regional staff had the confidence to award three of the four zones to Laidlaw. He noted that Laidlaw currently services over 85% of the households in the Region and felt confident that they can continue to provide the best service to the residents of the Region. He noted the Laidlaw recycling facility will be upgraded to handle the expanded blue box program. Laidlaw is a very stable and financially capable company with sufficient cash flows to cover the capital requirements needed to support the existing and expanded service levels for the Region. Mr. Beaudoin stated Laidlaw would be working closely with Regional staff to optimize the recycling program in the multi-tenant buildings.

The speaker expressed support for the expanded blue box program (needed to meet provincial diversion targets) and strongly supports weekly blue box service. He stated that the bi-weekly cost analysis contained in the staff report is in fact conservative and the actual cost differential is less than two cents per household per week. Mr. Beaudoin believes there would be a very large demand for extra blue boxes if the service is only bi-

weekly and suggested that the demand could be in the order of 100,000 additional blue boxes at an average price of \$4.25 each. The bi-weekly blue boxes are now full; adding new products will result in driving more products out of the blue box. He noted as an example, the program in Peel which is similar to what the Region is proposing and the weekly blue boxes are full. Mr. Beaudoin felt the promotional campaign planned by the Region will cause the program to be at least as successful as the Peel program.

To demonstrate the impact of changing from weekly to bi-weekly, Mr. Beaudoin used an overhead which showed the effect on the collection of paper, glass and metal cans for three municipalities (Ottawa, Nepean and Gloucester) in 1994 who switched from weekly to bi-weekly collection; there was a 10.23% drop in weight of the materials collected. This confirms what staff have stated in the report. Further, Mr. Beaudoin noted that municipalities with expanded programs, who have changed from weekly to bi-weekly have noticed an increase in the amount of litter being blown from the over-full boxes.

Mr. Beaudoin stated an informed public is essential to effective waste diversion programs. For over seven years, Laidlaw has used a multi-media environmental education program in the area schools. It explains to young people the hierarchy of sound waste management practices from recycling to waste disposal.

In conclusion, Mr. Beaudoin stated Laidlaw has made the environment their business, by playing a consistent leadership role, having high operating standards and being very much involved in the communities they serve. The speaker expressed Laidlaw's commitment to the Region and stated it is their wish to work together to create environmentally sound waste collection and recycling programs that are cost effective, efficient and convenient.

Jerry Marshall, Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI), noted that BFI is one of the world's largest publicly held environmental companies and he has been with them for 25 years. Mr. Marshall suggested that bi-weekly recycling would save the Region \$2.7 million over three years and possibly more than \$5 million over five years. The staff recommendation assumes that increasing the frequency of collection (from bi-weekly to weekly) will increase the recycling tonnages by 9% to 10%. This calculation assumes that additional material revenue will off-set some of the increased collection costs. Mr. Marshall felt this analysis is speculative and flawed. As an example, the speaker noted that the Region of Halton experienced a 1% increase in recyclable generation when they moved to bi-weekly collection from weekly.

Mr. Marshall disagreed that bi-weekly collection would cause confusion, as 90% of the residents of the Region currently receive bi-weekly recycling collection. Further, he did not feel additional blue boxes would be required for bi-weekly recycling collection if the residents were instructed to bag or bundle all fibres and to use the blue box for containers.

In conclusion, Mr. Marshall stated there are environmental benefits associated with bi-weekly recycling collection, namely, fewer vehicles on Regional roads, reduced fuel consumption, fewer air emissions and pollutants and reduced road maintenance. He urged the Committee not to adopt the Departmental recommendation, but rather take advantage of the opportunity to save the residents of the RMOC money and consider bi-weekly recycling collection.

Committee Chair Hunter questioned why BFI's bid for the A/B combination zone was greater than their total bids for Zone A and Zone B. Mr. Marshall advised that BFI could service either Zone A or Zone B without changing its operation. However, to service both would require moving their entire facility to a larger location and the capital costs associated with that.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Sheflin advised that the tender specifications clearly set out that the Region could award to the lowest bidder on Zone A and Zone B or Zone A/B.

At Committee Chair Hunter's request, Mr. McNally responded to the points raised by Mr. Marshall. Mr. McNally noted the actual collection costs for bi-weekly collection are less than weekly, however, there are other factors to be considered. Firm numbers on the leakage factor are difficult to come by; the estimate of 10% used by staff is believed to be realistic. He noted it is not so much that weekly blue box collection will gather more material but rather that with bi-weekly collection, residents will not have the patience or the storage capacity to wait and these materials will end up in the garbage. Lost revenue was calculated on 12,000 tonnes of material over three years at \$100 per tonne and, if the material has leaked from the blue box in to the garbage, tipping fees will have to be paid as well. The \$2.7 million difference is offset by \$1.9 million (increased tipping fees and lost revenues) and results in a difference of \$800,000; a premium of two cents per household per week. For this small amount, the convenience of weekly collection and reinforcement of the diversion message, staff feel that weekly collection is appropriate.

Councillor Hume asked Mr. Marshall for more information on the Region of Halton's experience. Brian Doublestein, responding on Mr. Marshall's behalf advised that information he obtained from Halton indicated the weekly collection numbers included material from the ICI sector whereas the bi-weekly collection numbers did not include this sector. He felt this was the reason that Regional staff's information was different than BFI's.

After hearing from all public delegations, the Committee then discussed the item.

Councillor Cullen expressed support for the staff recommendations, noting the importance of expanding the blue box program and increasing access to it on a weekly basis. He congratulated staff and the bidders on providing increased service at a reduced cost.

Councillor Hill put forward a motion to have bi-weekly blue box collection as she felt it would save the taxpayers money and therefore be in their best interest.

Councillor van den Ham asked staff if Councillor Hill's motion would affect the staff recommendations on contract awards. Mr. McNally advised that if bi-weekly collection were approved, staff would then recommend the lowest bidder in that scenario and this would change Recommendation 3; BFI would be recommended as the low bidder.

Councillor Munter expressed support for the staff recommendation, citing as the most important issue the fact the Region is trying to promote waste diversion and the way to do this is to have every garbage day be a blue box day.

Committee Chair Hunter noted at one time he supported bi-weekly collection, however he felt staff had effectively demonstrated that weekly collection for the expanded blue box program was most appropriate.

Move by B. Hill

**That the Blue Box Recycling Program collection be bi-weekly.**

LOST

NAYS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Hume, Hunter, Munter, Stewart and Chair Clark..7  
YEAS: Councillors Hill and van den Ham...2

Chair Hunter stated he supported all of the staff recommendations and in particular, he expressed agreement with the three year duration of the contracts. He felt that until the contracts are awarded and the Region has the opportunity to sit-back and analyse the operation, it will not be known whether the right choices were made. During the three years, the issues that should be looked at should include an analysis of a cost per household price (as opposed to a cost per tonne price); the reasons why some of the other waste handlers did not bid on the contracts; and, the size and number of zones necessary to encourage competition and better prices. In conclusion, the Chair noted that the options presented are as right as possible at this time and he commended staff on the job they have done in bringing this work forward to the Committee. He urged the members to support the staff recommendations.

Councillor Hume applauded staff for the excellent job they have done in saving the Region millions of dollars. He noted this is one of the most important services the Region will be delivering and it is the second service to evolve from the lower tier municipalities. Through these contracts, the Region is increasing the service for many of its residents as well as creating significant revenues that will flow from the recycling contracts. This demonstrates that money can be saved in amalgamating municipal services and making them as efficient as possible and more of this should be done. The Councillor felt the fact that taxpayers will be receiving better service for less money should be emphasized.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations.

**That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve:**

- 1. That the Blue Box Recycling Program collection be weekly.**
- 2. That the duration of the Solid Waste Collection Contracts term be for three years with extension options.**
- 3. That Zone A and B (as per attached map), for the curbside collection of garbage, recycling, leaf and yard waste and Christmas trees, Contract No. CE 5244AB be awarded to Laidlaw Waste Systems Ltd., 1152 Kenaston Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K1B 3P5 for a total estimated three year cost of \$28,035,242.**
- 4. That Zone C (as per attached map), for the curbside collection of garbage, recycling, leaf and yard waste and Christmas trees, Contract No. CE 5244C be awarded to 2889218 Canada Inc. (Exel Environmental) 683 Boulevard St Rene est, Gatineau, Quebec, J8P 7G7 for a total estimated three year cost of \$13,292,541.**
- 5. That Zone D (as per attached map), for the containerized collection of garbage and recycling, Contract No. CE 5244D be awarded to Laidlaw Waste Systems Ltd., 1152 Kenaston Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K1B 3P5 for a total estimated three year cost of \$7,161,732.**

CARRIED

2. Water Environment Protection Division  
Private Sector Involvement Opportunities  
- Director, Water Environment Protection Division report dated 29 Jan 96

Judy Wilson, Director, Water Environment Protection Division, introduced this item and provided a brief overview of the staff report. She noted that staff is recommending that tender proposals not be prepared for June 1996, as it is their belief it is too soon to be embarking on this process. The savings found while the Region is responsible for the treatment centre will go directly to the regional ratepayers. Achieving the greatest possible savings will also ensure that, when the Region does tender, there will be a good competition resulting in a price below any cost that can be established by the Region.

Councillor Munter asked when staff would be ready to tender. Ms. Wilson advised it would be best if staff came back with an interim report (i.e. 6 to 8 months) setting out the progress to-date. A reasonable expectation of when staff would be ready to go to tender, would be a full budget cycle and this would bring it to January 1997.

Responding to questions from Councillors Munter and Hume concerning the \$200,000 approved in the budget to hire a consultant to complete the tenders, Mr. Sheflin noted that because Council had approved tendering of the contracts by June 1996, staff had to include the money in their budget. He noted that staff advised during budget deliberations that this report would be before them for consideration.

Stan Spencer, Senior Vice President, Business Development, Philip Utilities Management Corporation, encouraged the Committee to proceed with the original plan of calling for tenders in June 1996. He explained that Philip Utilities is a large environmental company that got into water and wastewater treatment about two years ago when it entered into a private/public relationship with Hamilton-Wentworth. Since then, they have entered into six additional municipal contracts and are anticipating approximately 12 more within the next two months. The fact that municipalities are looking to contract out many services has attracted many large international firms to Canada and has created a very competitive market. He suggested that the time is ideal to go forward with the tender call and test the market against the Region's estimated cost of doing business. He believes the results will show that Region would be able to achieve savings now without waiting to go through a lengthy process of having to identify other cost savings.

Mr. Spencer stated it is his belief the private sector can produce lower cost solutions. Having worked in the public sector for some 20 years, the speaker stated that the key to private sector success, is the speed of decision making and the delegation of authority. He cited Hamilton-Wentworth, who went through a similar exercise, as an example, noting they were able to achieve a cost savings of \$1.4 million in the first year and an anticipated



\$1.2 million this year. The same opportunities exist in Ottawa-Carleton and can be achieved by accessing the private market now.

Mark Sanderson, PSG, requested that the Committee proceed with Regional Council's April 1995 resolution to solicit proposals from the private sector in June 1996. He felt the savings achieved by staff were not as low as those proposed by PSG last year and it is his belief there are additional savings to be had from contracting out. Private sector efficiencies are the main reason PSG would be able to save the Region money. Mr. Sanderson noted as well that PSG works with local firms as much as possible, encourages economic development opportunities and becomes part of the communities where they work. PSG is the leader in the industry because of its ability to save money while maintaining or improving service levels. As examples, Mr. Sanderson referred to savings achieved by PSG for the Island of Puerto Rico and Oklahoma City.

In conclusion, Mr. Sanderson advised that PSG has established its Canadian headquarters in Ottawa and has already begun to prepare for the Region's tender proposal. A tender call will keep the process transparent and allow staff to compete with the private sector. He asked that the private sector be allowed to demonstrate what they can do for the Region and then let Council decide.

Willie Bagnall, Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade, expressed alarm over the staff recommendation not to tender the contract as Council had directed. He felt that careful wording of the tender could save the ratepayers of Ottawa-Carleton even further amounts of money. The most important issue is to ensure that the most cost effective way of delivering services is found. Mr. Bagnall stated that even if the tender is not awarded, calling for proposals will create a playing field that is transparent and clear for all to see. The speaker felt this should be embarked upon as a challenge for the Region and the Departmental staff to work together with the private sector to save the rate payers even more money in these tough economic times. In conclusion, Mr. Bagnall expressed hope that the Committee and Council will approve a resolution to go ahead with the tender and take fair and appropriate action to award a contract to the best person that bids

Regional Chair Clark, referring to Mr. Bagnall's alarm over the staff recommendation, assured him that it is not a permanent situation but rather a request for an extension. Chair Clark noted staff have been preoccupied in dealing with the \$31 million in funding cuts from the Province and the assumption of former Provincial services. As well, there is a cost associated with preparing the tender proposals. These issues would preclude having the tender proposals ready for June 1996. Mr. Bagnall noted the money has been set aside in the budget and he believes Regional staff would be able, in conjunction with the consultants, to have the tender documents ready for June.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Ms. Wilson explained that staff's reason for the delay is to enable the Region to drive a hard bargain. By having the lowest possible budget benchmark (that all the tenderers will be looking at), the competition among bidders will be greater and the lowest prices will be attained.

Councillor Munter noted that \$200,000 had been allocated in the budget to hire a consultant to carry out this project. Mr. Sheflin responded that preparation of the tender documents would still require a lot of staff time. He expressed concern that if staff are working on the tender proposal then they are not optimizing savings.

Councillor Hill commended staff for the savings they have attained. She reminded members that staff have known for a year about Council's resolution to have prepared tender documents ready for June '96 and they should be ready to carry out Council's direction.

The Councillor noted the Region's experience is limited to the R.O. Pickard Centre, whereas private sector companies have experience with many plants around the world as well as the ever changing technology in this area. For these reasons, Councillor Hill felt that the Region could benefit from the private sector's experience and expertise. The Region has nothing to lose by tendering; if there are no savings to be had in the private sector, the Region does not have to award the contract.

Councillor Beamish expressed his belief that staff have no intention of going to tender as they believe they can operate the plant best. However, Council has an obligation to the public to carry through on the resolution to have tender documents prepared by June 1996. With regard to the \$200,000 approved in the budget for preparation of the tender documents, the Councillor felt this was excessive and unnecessary. He urged the Committee to support the original Council motion.

Chair Clark noted the original recommendation proposed by staff was that tender proposals would be ready by January 1997; this time-frame was to allow consolidation of the operations and to get the "house in order". There is no intent not to go out to tender. He cautioned that if Committee and Council approve the preparation of the tender proposals by June 1996, something else will not get done. The Chair noted the Region's goal should be to provide stable, responsible service to the public at the least possible cost; this will not be accomplished if staff rush to tender now. He asked the Committee to make a prudent management decision and support the staff recommendation.

Councillor Cullen expressed agreement with Chair Clark's comments. To ease concerns raised by Councillor Beamish, the Councillor put forward a motion to amend the staff recommendation to clarify that staff would be coming back with tender specifications by January 1997.

Responding to questions from Committee Chair Hunter, Ms. Wilson advised the PSG contract for the Biosolids management (one portion of the operation) cost approximately \$100,000 to prepare. Halton's request for qualifications cost \$70,000 and they have a budget of \$400,000 for the remainder of their process.

Chair Hunter noted that the two most important questions to be asked are "when and what". He stated he is convinced the Region should be moving forthwith to obtain proposals from the private sector for all parts of the operation.

Councillor McGarry stated he is convinced competition will take care of the price there. Staff have done a good job of saving money; however, they do not need to save more to get a good price. He expressed concern that delaying this process will result in poor relations with the REgion's corporate partners. He urged the Committee to move quickly on this matter.

Councillor van den Ham expressed support for the staff recommendation as amended by Councillor Cullen. He felt the additional time (to January 1997) requested by staff should be allowed so that they might reach the goals they have set.

Chair Clark put forward an amendment to Councillor Cullen's motion to specify "the operation of the Robert O. Pickard Centre".

Moved by P. Clark

**That Councillor Cullen's motion be amended by adding "for the operation of the Robert O. Pickard Centre"**

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

**That the words after "and" in the third line of the staff recommendation be deleted and replace with "to provide tender specifications by January 1997 for the operation of the Robert O. Pickard Centre".**

CARRIED  
(Councillor Hill dissented)

The Committee then considered the replacement motion put forward by Councillor Hill.

Moved by B. Hill

**That staff fulfil the direction of the Regional Council Motion of 12 April 1995 that a prepared tender proposal be brought back to Council in June 1996 for all parts of the operation of the treatment centre.**

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Hill, Hume, Hunter, Munter and Stewart.....6

NAYS: Councillor Cullen and Chair Clark.....2

Committee Chair Hunter clarified that although Councillor Cullen's and Chair Clark's motions to amend the Departmental recommendation carried, the Departmental recommendation as amended was not voted on. Councillor Hill's motion replaces the Departmental recommendation, as the recommendation of the Committee.

Ms. Wilson cautioned the wording of Councillor Hill's motion is much more limiting than the original language used. The original motion said "parts of" because staff were looking at the whole Division including the collection system, not just the plant. The parts to be excluded included policy issues and policy management. This motion limits tendering for operation of the plant only. She suggested the Committee's intention be clarified.

Commissioner Sheflin added that "parts" could mean the entire treatment centre or the pumping station or the pipe network pumping stations or whether the Region goes out in one contract or more than one contract. These are the types of things that will have to be developed and brought back to the Committee and Council by June of 96. It was staff's intention to bring back a recommendation on which parts to proceed to the private sector with and tender specifications for those parts. He suggested there are parts the Committee and Council may wish to exclude, such as the policy areas.

Councillor Beamish suggested that, if necessary, Councillor Hill's motion could be modified at Council.

Chair Hunter stated the Committee's intention is to adhere to the timetable approved last April and Councillor Hill's intent was to see "parts" clarified. He suggested the wording of the motion be looked at prior to Council to clearly set out the Committee's intent.

Councillor Beamish reminded members that with the solid waste contract, staff reported to Committee prior to preparing the tender documents. This allowed the Committee the opportunity to discuss what should be included in the tender and also allowed members of the public to have input. He asked if the same process could be followed in this instance.

Committee Chair Hunter noted if the tender proposals are to go to Council in June, they would have to come to Committee in early June or late May. A report to the Committee before the preparation of the tender documents would have to come forward in March. Chair Clark stated he believed such a report would come to the Committee first.

The Committee then approved the report, as amended, with Councillor Cullen and Chair Clark dissenting.

3. Water Environment Protection Division Biosolids Management Plan

- Director, Water Environment Protection Division report dated 30 Jan 96
- Information Background Report issued separately
- A copy of Appendices A to G is on file with the Regional Clerk

Chair Hunter pointed out this report was being tabled for public consultation.

Peggy Land, Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC), City of Gloucester, provided the Committee with a copy of her written brief, which is on file with the Regional Clerk. Ms. Land stated the EAC feels it is important to air their concerns about the Biosolids Management Plan now so that adequate time can be given for consideration.

The Environmental Advisory Committee was asked to provide input to the proposed Biosolids Management Plan as part of the public consultation process. Review of Mel Webber's report entitled "Organic and metal Contaminants in Canadian Municipal Sludges and a Sludge Compost" revealed levels of dioxins and furans; highly toxic even in minute amounts. When asked at the workshop why contamination by dioxins and furans did not seem to be of concern, Mr. Webber advised that no guidelines existed regarding acceptable concentrations; he deemed those levels found in the sludge to be acceptable.

Ms. Land stated her Committee then contacted Environment Canada regarding their toxics policy. The June 1995 news release states "Toxic substances determined to be persistent, bio-accumulative and resulting from human activity (Track 1), will be virtually eliminated from the environment". The Chair of the Federal-Provincial Task Force on Toxic Substances management Policy confirmed that local Biosolids are definitely Track 1. The speaker urged the Committee to consider this information and the Environmental Advisory Committee's recommendations (as contained in their brief) before proceeding with a policy on Biosolids management.

Councillor Cullen asked where staff stood with regard to acceptable concentrations of dioxins and furans. France Jacovella, Technical Support Branch, advised that the guidelines for sewage sludge application of biosolids on agricultural land do not address organic contaminants. What staff has done is look at the only guidelines available; those published for the decontamination of soils in Ontario. One of the recommendations of the

report is to continue to monitor development of regulations and new technology to be able to address this matter.

Councillor Cullen asked if a direction to enable staff to devote some time and resources to determining some form of standard for acceptable levels. Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation replied that the Province has to approve the application and they will be responsible for determining standards. Judy Wilson, Director, Water Environment Protection Division advised that staff has adopted contaminated site standards as a start. The purpose of tabling for two months is to find out if the public finds this method of operating acceptable. Councillor Cullen stated the report comes back in two months, he would like to have information on what the standards are and where the Region's sludge ordinarily fits.

Ms. Land noted the Federal-Provincial Task Force developed the guidelines she referenced earlier, in June 1996 after the biosolids management plan was drafted. This may be new information as it clearly states that any product, that contains any level of dioxin will be phased out. Ms. Land provided staff with copies of the documents that she referred to in her presentation.

Councillor Stewart suggested that staff should take advantage of the work undertaken by Gloucester's Environmental Advisory Committee and ensure that all of the information goes out to the public so that they are aware of the issues that have been raised.

Committee Chair Hunter thanked Ms. Land for taking the time to make her presentation and for putting her concerns forward.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

**That Planning and Environment Committee receive the attached report so that it may be tabled with the Committee to allow for public consultation for a period of two months. The final report including additional comments from the public will be submitted for approval in May 1996.**

RECEIVED

PLANNING ITEMS

4. Regional Official Plan Review: Review of Scope and Requirements  
- Acting Planning and Property Commissioner report dated 01 Feb 96

Pamela Sweet, A/Commissioner, Planning and Property Department, provided a brief presentation on the staff report.

Ms. Sweet confirmed for Councillor Cullen that if the staff report as presented is adopted, there would be a savings of \$102,000. Should Committee and Council wish to incorporate the three areas (rural issues, natural environment systems and housing policies) that staff are recommending be postponed to 1998, the savings would be approximately \$50,000.

Councillor Hume questioned the need for an amendment on housing policies. Ms. Sweet replied that the current official plan contained Sewell policies that were very specific to affordable housing. The review of the housing policies will be looked at in terms of the present Provincial governments policy statements, which are much less prescriptive. There has been a lot of work done with local municipal staff on the basics of the type of housing that residents of the Region would like to see. However, one of the reasons staff is suggesting that housing policies be put off is because it is anticipated the Province will make changes to the rent control, rental housing protection and shelter allowance policies; these could have a significant impact on the Region's housing policies.

Chris Jalkotzy, submitted a copy of his comments in writing (on file with the Regional Clerk). He noted that he had spoken with a number of people on the Regional Official Plan Review, to obtain a sense of their views on the Review. Mr. Jalkotzy read from an article in Impact by Caroline Castrucci, President, Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders' Association, which read in part "*The recent decision by the Regional Planning Committee to shelve their Official Plan Review is an excellent example of positive action and the results that occur when our members work together toward a common goal. There was a time not long ago when the Region's Official Plan Review was seen as an unstoppable machine, fueled by a massive budget and immense staff resources; the direction of the proposed Regional Official Plan seemed impossible to alter. But, when the recommendations of the new Official Plan appeared destined to drive growth and new homes out of the Region the Association and the Builder/Developer Council mobilized, the results as they say are history*".

Mr. Jalkotzy noted the need for everyone to pull together on the Review and to look at the common needs and goals. He referred to his written submission which offered the following recommendations:

1. stop any staff work on evaluating the preferred alternative.

2. hold a charette on the basic criteria established for the preferred alternative in the last report to this committee including a briefing session two to three weeks in advance of the workshop.
3. have these alternatives roughly evaluated by staff and consultants.
4. present the findings to committee including an evaluation of what further studies are necessary, committee to choose the preferred scenario at this time, send staff off to do part 2 detailed evaluation and relevant studies.
5. approval of regional development strategy.
6. draft official plan amendment.

In conclusion, Mr. Jalkotzy referred to a document entitled "Interviews with a Sample of Business Executives in Ottawa-Carleton" prepared by the Region. He drew the Committee's attention to a section dealing with decisions/actions taken by the Region, which the executives have found damaging to their businesses. The issue that came in highest was that taxes and the cost of doing business in Ottawa-Carleton are too high. Mr. Jalkotzy stated that the only way to reduce the cost of taxes and doing business in Ottawa-Carleton is by dealing with the urban forum.

Committee Chair Hunter asked for staff comment on Mr. Jalkotzy's suggestion of holding a charette. Ms. Sweet noted that the Region has held charettes in the past and have found them helpful; one could be considered as part of the Review's public consultation process. She cautioned however, that charettes tend to attract a certain type of person that has an interest in the Regional Official Plan Review. As well, charettes require a great deal of work and staff time.

Amy Kempster, Federation of Citizen's Association, stated she was dismayed at the direction taken by Planning and Environment Committee on 9 Jan 96. She said that integrated planning is a much more valid way of proceeding than a piece-meal approach. The FCA does not want to see the review broken up. The Community Vision clearly indicated that the citizens of this region want the policies set out in Part II of the staff report, included in the review. As the development strategy will require that these four areas (economic policies, rural issues, natural environment systems and housing policies) be looked at, Ms. Kempster suggested they be done with the Review.

The FCA feels that innovative ways to carry out public consultation should be examined; such things as Councillors hosting meetings in their own wards on various aspects of the Review. Ms. Kempster offered the FCA's assistance in holding public consultation sessions. In conclusion, the speaker stated it would be better to keep the whole review together and extend the time for completion, than to separate portions of it.

Bruce Benson, Association of Rural Property Owners, explained his purpose for appearing before the Committee was to ensure that the interests of rural property owners were being



looked after and that decisions were not being made that would impact on them in the future. He referred to the great amount of paper work he has received from the Region and noted it has been impossible to keep on top of the issues.

Mr. Benson raised the following concerns. Referring to the clause “shall have regard to”, the speaker asked that the Region convince him this is indeed better than “shall be consistent with”. Concerning municipalities autonomy in deciding how to implement policies and the fact that municipalities retain the authority to go beyond the minimum standards established by the Policy statements, Mr. Benson felt the wording should be more specific and limiting.

Referring to staff’s recommendation that Rural Issues be deferred to early 1998, Mr. Benson felt that rural issues have been dragging on too long and should be dealt with in the context of the Review. Turning to the Natural Environment Systems, staff is recommending that the Wetlands policies be dealt with in 1996, as an amendment in response to the Wetlands Working Group recommendations. He asked what staff was proposing to amend.

Responding to the issues raised by Mr. Benson concerning the phrase “shall have regard to” and municipalities’ authority to go beyond the minimum standards of the Provincial Policy statements, Ms. Sweet advised that the report merely set out the wording of the new draft Policy Statements (which is the topic of Item 5). She agreed that staff must ensure that the rural residents are kept informed. Regarding the wetlands amendment, it is staff’s contention that because of the amount of work done by the Wetlands Working Group, an amendment should proceed as quickly as possible. Ms. Sweet assured the Committee and Mr. Benson that the rural residents would be advised when a proposal for the amendment is scheduled for consideration by Planning and Environment Committee.

At Councillor Cullen’s request, Ms. Sweet confirmed that this report before the Committee deals with the workplan for the Regional Official Plan Review and does not deal with actual policy content.

Regional Chair Clark noted the Province has not yet finished its set of regulations and it would be best to wait for their changes before the Region makes changes to its wetlands policies.

Having heard from all public delegations, the Committee then discussed the matter.

Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to be substituted with the staff recommendation, that would move those items in Part II of the staff report back into the Review to be completed in June 1997. The items contained in Part III, can be postponed for possible review in 1998. The Councillor noted that rural issues, natural environment systems and

housing policies are vital to the Regional Official Plan and should be included in the Review. There will be plenty of opportunity for public input into all of these issues. With respect to the other projects being put off, the Councillor felt that the Council in 1998 can decide what ought to proceed and how. These are areas that require some work, but it is a question of priority and staff have indicated that work on these items can occur after 1997.

Ms. Sweet clarified at Councillor Hunter's request that Councillor Cullen's motion would have the effect of making Priority II issues Priority I and would be completed in the context of the full Official Plan Review by June 1997.

The Committee then considered the motions put forward.

Moved by P. Hume

**That 1) Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Master Plan, 2) Floodplain Policies, and 3) Energy Conservation be eliminated from the Regional Official Plan review work plan.**

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Hill, Hume, van den Ham and Chair Clark.....5

NAYS: Councillors Cullen, Hunter, Munter and Stewart....4

Councillor Cullen's motion, as amended by Councillor Hume, was then considered.

Moved by A. Cullen

**That the Regional Official Plan Review *proceed* on the basis of the following policy area being postponed:**

- **Contaminated sites**

**and that this policy area be reviewed for possible study in 1998, following Council's adoption of the revised Regional Official Plan.**

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Hume, Munter and Stewart.....5

NAYS: Councillors Hill, Hunter, van den Ham and Chair Clark....4

Moved by A. Munter

**That staff be directed to look into holding a charette as part of the consultation process.**

LOST

NAYS: Councillors Hill, Hume, Stewart, van den Ham and Chair Clark....5

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Hunter and Munter.....4

The Committee then approved the report as amended, with Councillor Hill and Chair Clark dissenting on the whole report and Councillor Hume dissenting on Part II (4) Housing Policies.

5. Proposed Provincial Policy Statement to Guide Land Use Planning in Ontario  
- Acting Planning and Property Commissioner report dated 31 Jan 96

Marni Cappe, Manager, Housing, provided an overview of the staff report.

Committee Chair Hunter raised the possibility of numerous referrals to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) because of the "have regard to" clause and because of the generally more permissive nature of the Policy Statements. He noted the Policy Statements allow Regional and Area Municipalities to be more restrictive in their Official Plans and Zoning By-Laws, and wondered if these would be recognized as paramount.

Ms. Cappe explained the onus has now shifted to the municipalities to implement the Policy Statements and to be clear on criteria against which development is evaluated. If this takes place, and Official Plans are clear, there should not be more referrals to the OMB. It is generally agreed the Planning Act, Bills 20 and 163 have established that development applications and lower-tier Official Plan subdivisions must *conform with* Official Plans, whereas they need only *have regard to* the Policy Statements. Once the Official Plan is approved by the Province and it is deemed the Region has had regard to those Policy Statements, then the Region would be approving developments in accordance with the Region's approved Official Plan.

Tim Marc, Legal Department, commented generally, the most restrictive document is going to be paramount. As well, it was part of Committee's submissions on Bill 20 that the Official Plan, once approved, be deemed to have had regard to the Policy Statements.

Chair Hunter stated that when the proposed comprehensive Policy Statements were brought in by the previous government, submissions were made to the Sewell Commission and to Provincial Legislative Committee Hearings that Provincial Policy Statements were

quickly changeable by Orders-in-Council, whereas Official Plans had to go through a rigorous process of public hearings, etc. This was a problem with the phrasing of "must be consistent with" Provincial Policy Statements. Mr. Marc noted, if the Region is successful in amending the Planning Act so that the Region's Official Plan is deemed to have had regard to Provincial Policy Statements, this would only apply to Policy Statements in effect at the time the Region's Official Plan was approved.

Councillor Cullen quoted Sections 2.2 (Mineral Resources, Mineral Aggregates, Mineral Petroleum Resources), and 2.2.4 (Prime Agricultural Areas) of the Provincial Policy regarding Mineral Aggregate extraction below the waterline on Prime Agricultural Lands, and subsequent agricultural rehabilitation. He inquired whether, if the applicant determined that agricultural rehabilitation was not suitable or otherwise viable, then there would be no requirement for the applicant to do so. Ms. Cappe replied that was her interpretation, and this was one problem with the Policy in the absence of guidelines. Staff's review of mineral aggregate policies compared to what was currently in place revealed that substantively, there was no difference. The Councillor stated his preference that a public body have the ability to oversee the suitability for agricultural rehabilitation.

The Councillor noticed that in Section 1.2.(c) of the report dealing with housing, staff recommended rewording the policy "to encourage municipalities to provide opportunities for housing for low- and moderate-income households". He noted the Federation of Citizens' Associations suggestion that the Region should be encouraging municipalities to have policies to this effect, and suggested rewording the policy "to encourage the municipalities to provide *policies for* opportunities for housing for low- and moderate-income households".

The Committee then heard from public delegations.

Chris Jalkotzy addressed the Committee and said he would be speaking on behalf of both himself and Dr. M.E. (Meg) Sears, who could not attend. He provided members with a copy of a brief prepared by Dr. Sears, which is on file with the Regional Clerk. He stated the issue of water quality was one of the most important issues to be dealt with; it is important to sustaining the Region, and one that crosses boundaries beyond Ottawa-Carleton. He offered that Ottawa-Carleton is at the bottom of the watershed and that flooding problems resulting from upstream development and water contamination problems resulting from septic beds and related issues would have a financial effect on the Region. He suggested the Region should be telling the Province that, while it is all right to have changes in the administration and implementation of standards, it is necessary to have a basic Policy that is Province-wide because political boundaries do not extend to watershed hinterlands. He stated that those in the environmental community are not very hopeful about the next few years, but are taking solace in the fact that potential damage is being mitigated by harsher economic times for development.

He urged the Region to send a message to the Province that it cannot expect to solve a fiscal deficit while creating an environmental one; the environmental deficit will have to be solved with cash at a later date. He asked the Committee to look seriously at the suggestions submitted by Dr. Sears.

Amy Kempster, President, Federation of Citizens' Associations (FCA), provided a written submission which is on file with the Regional Clerk. She voiced the FCA's disagreement with staff's position on the "have regard to" clause, as she felt it would create a patchwork of policies across the Province. Further, the Province is abdicating responsibility, which will require more responsibility on the part of municipalities. She said it would be better if the Province were to bring forth policies through the Legislative process, rather than through an Order-in-Council process. Provincial policies are in order, as there is a need for some rules to cross uniformly throughout the Province.

She said the FCA was generally in support of the report, and suggested that with regard to the Canadian Shield and the Carp Hills, perhaps the Region could ask for a geographical designation ("Southern and Eastern Ontario"), rather than a geological one, which would solve the Carp Hills and Adjacent Area problem to a large extent. With regard to point six, the FCA feels the policy on non-residential development in farm areas is unnecessary, as it is covered in 1.1.1. (c) 1.

Ms. Kempster stated the FCA feels the *definitions* conceal many traps, citing "negative impact" in particular. She felt this meant that a development could only be refused if the "negative impact" implied the loss of the whole area. The suggestion from the City of Ottawa for a modification of the definition was valid.

The speaker highlighted a suggestion that in Section 1.3.2., pertaining to Transportation Policy, the Region request the term "accessible" be added before the words "safe, environmentally sensitive, etc." She felt it was necessary to remind the Provincial Government of the helpful role of conservation authorities, and suggested that the Region in its statement remind the Province that there is a question of cooperation across a provincial border in this area.

Ms. Kempster felt that "unnecessary" should be deleted from the phrase "unnecessary and/or uneconomic" in Section 1.1.2. (a), as a case could be made that every development requires services and infrastructure, whereas it may be uneconomic compared to other alternatives.

Councillor Stewart noted the submissions by FCA and Dr. Sears recognized the role of conservation authorities, their ability to reach across municipal boundaries and their function in providing an appropriate structure and coordinating approach in dealing with

riverine and watershed-related issues. Referring to Section 1.1.1. (e), she asked why staff had not commented. Ms. Cappe replied the FCA's suggestion to reinforce the role of conservation authorities was a good one, and that she had no objection.

On Section 2.3.1., regarding change in wetlands, the Councillor noted that in 1995, the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence region was used for wetland study; in 1996, the Canadian Shield and Frontenac Access. She felt there was a failure to consider significant wetland area within the RMOC, in the Carp Hills and Rideau Valley watershed, and this would have a tremendous impact on the quality and quantity of water for the Region should these areas be developed.

Ms. Cappe commented that the department was unsure as to what recommendation to put to the Province regarding wetlands if the Policy was not to be supported as drafted. There was concern about pre-establishing a policy indirectly through a comment to the Province on wetlands before there was a chance to present the full outcome of the Wetlands Working Group to Committee and Council for the consideration and delineation of wetland policies locally. Councillor Stewart suggested the current wetland evaluation system for wetlands in the Southern Ontario portion of the Canadian Shield be used to determine significance, and that these wetlands be included in the Policy.

David Miller, Environmental Planner, Policy Division, said this would provide a consistent approach to Provincially Significant Class I-III Wetlands, returning to the former Wetland Policy Statement. The impact, in terms of wetlands in Ottawa-Carleton, would be primarily on the Carp Hills or Carp Ridge wetland areas; there would be no development, as in other areas of Provincially Significant Wetlands in Ottawa-Carleton. He said consistent bases would make sense in terms of wetland policy, but the Region has an outstanding wetland amendment to address this issue. Outside of Ottawa-Carleton, the dilemma is that the Region might have an interest in certain areas now within less restrictive areas, and although it would still have to be demonstrated that development would have no adverse effect upon these wetlands, the Region would have no input into these studies or their judgement by adjacent municipalities.

Addressing point 2.3.2., Councillor Stewart said she would like to return to where the policy was before, and add the words "along significant shorelines of lakes, rivers and streams" following "fish habitat". She felt the current wording was too ambiguous, and that the Policy Statement appeared to be neutral in encouraging municipalities to protect important functions and features.

The Councillor suggested adding "that recognize ecosystems approach for watershed and groundwater issues" after the word "implementation" to the Regional recommendation on Section 2.4, Water Quality and Quantity. The Province should strongly support the systems approach and particularly water quality and quantity watershed management.

On Item 3, Public Health and Safety, the Councillor asked staff for comment on bringing forward the 1988 Flood Plain Policy Statement without amendment. Mr. Miller replied that he saw no intent to vary substantially from that policy statement.

Commenting on the *definitions*, Councillor Stewart suggested that "site alterations" be added, and one of the examples would include the placement of fill in wetlands and topsoil removal. The Councillor wondered why this area of the Policy Statement had been removed. Mr. Miller suspected there had been an effort by the Province to remove some of the ambiguity about the purpose of the Policy Statement under the Planning Act. Site alteration is not necessarily a Planning Act application in every case.

The Councillor also noted the definition for fill construction and alteration to waterways regulation had been removed, and questioned why the Region was supporting its removal, or had not commented on same. The Councillor felt that when the cumulative impact of fill in the floodplain were considered, and if the door to floodplain development were opened, it might prove useful to have a regulation which might be able to control it.

Due to the late hour, Chair Hunter suggested all Motions and submissions be received and referred to staff for review, and that staff return with a report at the next meeting. Council, in order to meet the Provincial deadline for submission of comments, will be asked to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider the report at its meeting of 28 Feb 96.

The following Motions were then tabled:

Moved by A. Cullen:

That the Region's response to the Provincial Policy Statement be amended to include recognition of the linkages between social and human service needs and land use planning.

That the following be added to section 1.1.1.(c) 3: "Urban expansions follow consideration by municipalities of intensification of currently designated urban areas. Where urban expansion occurs, municipalities should consider the use of compact form of development."

That the staff recommendation under Housing, section 1.2 (c), be amended by adding "policies for" in front of "opportunities" (see pg. 41 staff report).

That section 2.2.4.(2) be amended (third dash) by deleting "by the applicant".

Moved by W. Stewart:

That the Region recommend that the 1988 Flood Plain Policy Statement be brought forward without amendment. (Point 3)

That the current wetland evaluation system for wetlands in the southern Ontario portion of the Canadian shield be used to determine significance; and that these wetlands be included in the policy (Section 2.3.1.).

That after "fish habitat", the words "along significant shorelines of lakes, rivers and streams" be added, and that the policy be reworded to clearly express that the Province "encourage and support" municipalities in protecting important features and functions (Section 2.3.2.).

Under "Definitions";

1. That "site alterations" be added to the definition of development; and
2. That the definition of "Fill, Construction and Alteration to Waterways Regulation" be added.

That the phrase "that recognize ecosystems approach for watershed and groundwater issues" be added to the RMO recommendation after the word "implementation".

Moved by A. Cullen:

**That the motions tabled by Councillors A. Cullen and W. Stewart and the written documents submitted by the Federation of Ottawa-Carleton Citizens' Associations and by M.E. Sears be referred to staff to report back to the 27 Feb 96 Planning and Environment Committee meeting for consideration.**

CARRIED

6. Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton's Comments on the  
Initial Environmental Evaluation Prepared for the Greenbelt Master Plan  
- Acting Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 26 Jan 96 issued separately

**That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council forward this report to the National Capital Commission as the Regional response to the Initial Environmental Evaluation of the Greenbelt Master Plan.**

CARRIED



7. Naming Hunt Club Road Extension, West of Woodroffe Avenue,  
City of Nepean  
- Planning and Property Commissioner report dated 17 Jan 96

**That Planning and Environment Committee (acting as the Regional Street Naming Committee) recommend that Council approve the following:**

- 1. That the Hunt Club road extension (Regional Road 32) west of Woodroffe Avenue, including portions of Knoxdale Road (Regional Road 52) west of the Arlington Woods Community to Richmond Road, be named “WEST HUNT CLUB ROAD”.**
- 2. That the portion of Knoxdale Road (Regional Road 52) intersecting with Riverbrook Road in the Arlington Woods Community and the remnant portion east of Greenbank Road be renamed “SISKIN COURT” and “GIBBARD AVENUE” respectively.**
- 3. That the realigned portion of Knoxdale Road (Regional Road 52) east of Greenbank Road where it intersects with West Hunt Club Road be named “KNOXDALE ROAD”.**

CARRIED

RESPONSE TO INQUIRIES

8. Response to Planning and Environment Committee Inquiry No. 10  
- Finance Commissioner’s memorandum dated 23 Jan 96

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

RECEIVED

ADDITIONAL ITEM

9. Deschênes Rapids Hydroelectric Dam Proposal  
(Ottawa River At Aylmer, P.Q.)

Moved by A. Cullen

**That the Rules of Procedure be suspended to deal with the following Motion:**

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

**WHEREAS there is a proposal to build a hydroelectric power dam on part of the Deschênes Rapids on the Ottawa River;**

**WHEREAS it is important to ensure that any such construction not imperil the communities in Ottawa-Carleton with respect to exposure to the 100-year flood;**

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that any approvals for such a project be conditional on it having no impact on the current 100-year floodplain, as confirmed by the technical agencies having relevant jurisdiction on both sides of the Ottawa River; and**

**That the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton communicate this resolution to the City of Aylmer, the City of Ottawa, the City of Nepean, the Communauté Urbaine de l'Outaouais, Ministry of Natural Resources (Québec), Ministry of Natural Resources (Ontario), Ministry of Environment & Wildlife (Québec), Ministry of Energy & Environment (Ontario) and Environment Canada.**

CARRIED

The Committee agreed that Council would be requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to deal with this matter at their meeting of 14 Feb 96.

#### **INQUIRIES**

Councillor Munter, referring to the Ontario Municipal Board's recent direction for further studies regarding the Kanata North Urban Expansion Area, asked what the implications of the OMB decision will be for the Region and the City of Kanata. Tim Marc, Solicitor, Legal Department advised that a report on this matter had been drafted and would be distributed to Councillors soon.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Committee Chair Hunter advised the Committee that Judy Wilson, Director, Water Environment Protection Division will be leaving the RMOC to move to Toronto. He thanked Ms. Wilson for her years of service and wished her well in her endeavours.

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

- **Special Briefing Session - Solid Waste Collection Contract**  
Environment and Transportation Commissioner's Memorandum dated 19 Jan 96

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

---

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

---

COMMITTEE CHAIR