

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

25 MAY 1999

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 11 May 99.

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENT ITEMS

1. PUBLIC CONSULTATION - TRAIL ROAD LANDFILL ASSET MANAGEMENT AND LANDFILL OPTIMIZATION STUDY
-Director, Solid Waste Division Environment and Transportation
Department report dated 07 May 1999

Pat McNally, Director, Waste Management Division and Kevin Wylie, Coordinator, Waste Diversion Branch, made a brief presentation to the Committee, providing an overview of the optimization study, the public consultation and the next steps to be taken if optimization is the option approved by Committee and Council. Copies of the slides used in the presentation are held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Committee Chair Hunter noted Mr. McNally had stated in his presentation, that the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) could reject the optimization option. He asked staff

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 9 June 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 33.

to elaborate on this. Mr. McNally indicated if the Region chooses to proceed and optimize the site, it will need a number of different approvals along the way. One of those approvals is the MOE's. At this point, a technical feasibility study has been completed, which indicates that optimization appears to be feasible based on the extent that it has been looked at to date. Staff feel if the recommendations presented in the staff report are adopted by Committee and Council, it enhances the Region's position in going forward but advised there is no guarantee that the Ministry will approve optimization.

Chair Hunter then asked if the technologies suggested for optimization of the landfill had been approved elsewhere in Ontario. Mr. McNally advised over the last few years the MOE has become more receptive to some of the technologies put forward. He said certain of the solutions suggested (e.g. going higher, mining landfills) are currently being done in various parts of Ontario, each subject to MOE approval.

Councillor van den Ham stated he would have thought the MOE would be in support, in principle, of optimization of a landfill. Mr. McNally indicated it would be difficult to speak for the MOE, however, he felt it safe to say the MOE would be in support of sound waste management practices and he noted the Region has been fairly aggressive with respect to its waste management programs (e.g. waste diversion). He offered the Region has taken as many of the right steps as it can, but at this point, the question must be put to the MOE.

Responding to further questions from Councillor van den Ham concerning the option of incineration, Mr. McNally advised this study looked specifically at optimizing the landfill and he said staff will ask the MOE to scope the environmental assessment down to optimizing the landfill. He went on to say five years ago, looking for a waste disposal solution, would have involved looking at a wide spectrum of options (e.g. landfill, incineration, export, etc.) and the process dictated what was acceptable under the Environmental Assessment Act.

Councillor Legendre had questions concerning the length of time it would take to find a new site, should optimization not be accepted by the MOE. Mr. McNally advised, in the early 1990's the site selection process took between six to ten years, with no guarantee that a site would be found at the end of the process. In 1997, the MOE introduced some changes to the Environmental Assessment Act, including the scoping option, in an effort to shorten the time lines and bring more certainty to the process. He noted Trail Road landfill is projected to last until 2008-2009; if optimization is rejected as an option, it is essential that the Region start looking for a new site immediately.

Councillor Legendre then referred to the consultant's summary at page 13 of Agenda and noted he was intrigued by the support for incineration. He inquired if the survey qualified

incineration as high temperature incineration. Mr. McNally advised the phone survey did not go into a great deal of detail.

Councillor Munter asked if the question put to those surveyed was “Are you in favour of incineration?” or “Are you willing to live within five kilometres of an incinerator?”. Mr. McNally advised he believed it was just a general question with respect to different types of waste disposal options.

Responding to concerns expressed by Councillor van den Ham Mr. McNally advised Stage 3 is very close to being full and that is why it is important for Committee and Council to proceed so that if the Region does eventually optimize, money is not invested (i.e. in capping Stage 3) that could be saved.

At this juncture, Committee Chair Hunter temporarily left the chair and Vice-Chair Stewart took over. The Committee then heard from the following speakers.

Mrs. Sinha made a presentation to Committee, using a map of the area of Trail Road Landfill site. She asked if the Committee was aware that when a landfill site reaches its potential, it is leveled, landscaped and returned to its own municipality (i.e. Nepean in this instance) for the nominal sum of \$1.00. Mrs. Sinha then gave a brief history of the site, noting Nepean Township originally started with 72 acres in 1962 which was taken over by the Region after it was created in 1968. She pointed out millions of dollars have been spent over the years on consultants, engineering reports, public participation, etc. reviewing the life of the landfill site. Since the landfill site began, the 72 acres has increased to 906.91 acres.

Mrs. Sinha went on to say that despite objections from people such as herself, there has never been an Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearing on the landfill site. She suggested that independent engineers be hired to assess the life of the landfill and she opined they would agree that the average life of a landfill is only ten years. Mrs. Sinha offered Trail Road was the wrong place for a landfill as it is on sand and gravel and less than a quarter of a mile from the Jock River.

In closing Mrs. Sinha stated the use of Trail Road Landfill site should be stopped and for the sake of the “children of tomorrow”, the sooner an alternative is found the better.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mrs. Sinha confirmed she is against optimization.

Werner Daechsel Vice-president Outreach appeared before Committee and provided copies of his presentation (held on file with the Regional Clerk).

Mr. Daechsel began by congratulating the consultants on their very "open" report. He then went on to suggest another recommendation be added to the report that an anaerobic digester be added to the leachate circulation line (Cell 3). He said this process would speed up the degradation of Cell 3 and would also provide additional methane which can be used. Mr. Daechsel expressed agreement with the notion of capping Cell 3 and suggested the preferable option would be a poplar forest instead of a plastic cap. He then expressed the hope Committee would meet the challenge put forward by Mr. Martin (the Federal Finance Minister) with respect to environmental proposals. Mr. Daechsel referred Committee to the proposals contained in his submission.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked Mr. McNally if staff had considered the options presented by Mr. Daechsel. Mr. McNally indicated although he had not had an opportunity to review Mr. Daechsel's submission, he would do so. He sought clarification from Mr. Daechsel on the recirculation of leachate in Stage 3, to which Mr. Daechsel stated he was proposing the leachate be ran through the anaerobic digester (as opposed to circulation in its raw form, as is done currently) and then recirculated.

In response to comments from Chair Hunter, Mr. Daechsel stated he felt comfortable his proposals would be looked at and he stated his group would be happy to work with staff to evaluate which type of anaerobic digester would be best suited to this site.

Councillor Munter indicated he would be putting forward a motion directing staff to examine the alternatives proposed by Mr. Daechsel.

Responding to questions posed by Councillor Munter, Mr. McNally indicated staff would like go forward with the concept of optimization to the Ministry of Environment (MOE). Then, if the decision is to optimize, the operational details may be looked at within the scope of optimizing the site. He stressed, at the moment, staff was looking for endorsement on the optimization question to enable them to go forward to the MOE.

Councillor Munter had further questions concerning potential federal funding and the possibility of pilot projects for the alternatives proposed. Nancy Schepers, A/Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department noted staff are continually looking for funding opportunities and opportunities to enhance the daily operations, which could include taking advantage of things such as those suggested, as the optimization study goes forward.

Joseph King, Barrhaven Sewer Action Committee stated this is a technical feasibility report and is not cast in stone. He said the group he represents supports the principles inherent to this report primarily because part of the optimization study does result in the improvement of the current site and improvement of the technology being used on site. The Barrhaven Sewer Action Committee believes optimization needs to be looked at in an

holistic way. In their opinion, optimization of the site includes such things as the composting programs and recycling (including the recycling of the landfill). As well, leachate management, capping, groundwater management, research options, land use and ownership, partnerships (including the federal government, the MOE and private sector investors) should all come into play in the optimization.

Mr. King indicated each person in Region has a role and interest in the long term management of this asset (Trail Road Landfill). He expressed the hope the Environmental Assessment (EA) will identify a number of options, although he had the impression the intent was to return only one option. Mr. King then congratulated staff on the report, noting it creates a good focal point for the Region to manage this asset.

Charlotte Greer, Gloucester South Community Association, stated she was very pleased with the report. However, she did express concern with one part of the report having to do with incineration. Ms. Greer noted this was addressed in 1984-85, and she asked if this option would be considered within the context of optimization. Mr. McNally clarified the question of incineration was only introduced as part of the public consultation in the phone survey; it was not considered at all in the optimization study.

Ms. Greer then went on to speak about older landfill sites in and around the area and asked if any thought had been given to re-mining those sites as part of the optimization. Mr. McNally pointed out the sites referred to were privately owned landfill sites; with respect to one site in particular (the Range Road site), Mr. McNally indicated the Department had not looked at it.

Councillor Legendre noted Ms. Greer's concern with incineration and opined the current technology of very high temperature incineration, is far from what may have been explored in the mid-eighty's. He advised high temperature incineration produces an end product that looks like glass, is inert in every aspect and would not harm the environment.

Responding to questions posed by Councillor Legendre, Mr. McNally confirmed incineration is now legal in Ontario.

In concluding her comments, Ms. Greer indicated her main concern was ensuring that incineration was not being included in the optimization option, noting one of the main problems in 1984-85 was the lack of public consultation.

There being no further speakers, the Committee considered the motion put forward by Councillor Munter.

Moved by A. Munter

That Staff be directed to include the proposals from the Citizen Review Committee (anaerobic digester and poplar forest capping) in their consideration of options for optimizing the Trail Road site.

CARRIED

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen expressed her concurrence with the optimization of the landfill site from an economic and environmental perspective and indicated she would support it when it comes to Council. She acknowledged the Barrhaven Sewer Action Committee and the Citizens' Review Committee for Waste Management of Ottawa Carleton for their continued interest and support.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen then referred to a letter distributed to Committee from Richard and Roseanne Hill, dated 25 May 1999 and asked that it be attached to the report to Council. She noted they are the closest residents to the landfill site and they have concerns about optimization. At the time Mr. and Mrs. Hill built their home, it was the Region's view the landfill site had a life expectancy and therefore they would not be living forever beside the landfill site (as a functioning landfill site). They understandably have some concerns about the long-term effects to their property.

The Councillor went on to speak about the effects on rural land owners in the vicinity of the landfill, pointing out in spite of improvements to technology and the management of the landfill site, there are still odours, garbage truck traffic, concerns about leachate and groundwater contamination. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen also relayed compliments she had received from neighbours to the landfill site, about Mr. Watson and Mr. McNally's efforts to keep them informed of the situation.

Committee Chair Hunter stated he was familiar with the Hill house and noted it was at least a kilometre west of Trail Road Landfill site and he surmised only one truck per week would likely go by their house. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen pointed out the Region bought the land directly across from the Hill property, to use as buffer lands.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. The summary results of the public consultation process for Trail Road Landfill Optimization be received for information;**
- 2. The concepts outlined in the Trail Road Landfill Asset Management and Landfill Optimization Study be accepted;**

3. **Staff be directed to pursue the options outlined in the Trail Road Landfill Asset Management and Landfill Optimization Study.**
4. **Staff be directed to include the proposals from the Citizen Review Committee (anaerobic digester and poplar forest capping) in their consideration of options for optimizing the Trail Road site.**

CARRIED as amended

2. REGIONAL REGULATORY CODE 1999 RATE ADJUSTMENTS AND TERMINOLOGY CHANGES

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner report dated 11 May 1999

Councillor Stewart noted on page 24 of the report, it states the additional fees have been built in to the budget as approved in February by Council. She asked what effect it would have if Committee and Council now made changes to these rates. Nancy Schepers, A/Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department indicated the proposed changes to the fees were not significant and if Committee or Council were to amend them at this point, it would not result in a budget shortfall.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Ms. Schepers explained the bulk of the fee changes presented to Committee were based on actual costs. On an annual basis staff review the operating costs associated with the various activities and recalculate the fees based on actual expenditures in the previous year.

Councillor Stewart then asked, with respect to the Annual Permit Fee (page 19), if the septage haulers had been consulted. France Jacovella, Manager, Wastewater Collection Branch, advised there had been no consultation for the change in fees. She pointed out there had been consultation prior to the implementation of the fees in 1996 (e.g for hauled waste, special discharge agreements and compliance programs) and there had been very limited response. Ms. Jacovella went on to explain the fee presented, reflected the actual cost of issuing the permit, based on the number of hours it takes to issue the permit and the fact that these vehicles have code tags mounted on, that have to be replaced periodically. She said when the fee of \$100 was first introduced, code tags had not been installed and there was no experience with the actual cost of maintaining them. With a few years of experience, it has consistently cost \$180 to issue a permit.

With respect to the Sanitary Sewer Agreement, Councillor Stewart questioned why it had increased from \$100 to \$500. Ms. Jacovella replied when the Sanitary Sewer Agreement was first introduced in 1998, there had been limited experience with capturing the costs of issuing the agreement. She explained the \$500 represents the actual costs associated with the required sampling program, analysis and preparation of the agreement. Councillor Stewart asked if there would be a backlash because of these increases. Ms. Jacovella advised the Region has less than six sanitary sewer agreements in a year and these are not annual fees but rather one time fees.

Councillor Stewart referred to page 20, (Parameters in Sewage) and questioned the proposed lower fees. Ms. Jacovella explained the fees are calculated based on the cost of operating and maintaining the wastewater treatment and conducting the industrial waste program. Over the years, the Water Environment Protection Division has been very aggressive in driving its costs down. Councillor Stewart asked if the lowering of the fees would not encourage industry to send substandard wastewater for treatment. Ms. Jacovella stated the report before the Committee identified the average cost of treating 1 kilogram of BOD, 1 kilogram of suspended solids, etc.; it did not address policy issues with respect to decisions the Region may want to take.

Councillor Hill expressed concern as well, about some of the proposed increases and questioned staff further as to the length of time required to issue an Annual Permit. Ms. Jacovella replied the average amount of time to issue an Annual Permit is three hours. This consists of reviewing information submitted by the hauler and each truck that is licensed to haul liquid waste must have a Certificate of Approval (C of A) from the Ministry of Environment (MOE). As the receiver of the hauled waste, the Region has the responsibility to ensure the carrier has the proper permit and C of A to bring the waste to the Pickard Centre.

Councillor Hill stated she could not understand why these fees have gone up so much. Ms. Jacovella advised the increase is not due so much to the number of hours but more to the life of the code tag that is used for each vehicle. When first introduced, it was envisaged that a code tag would last many years and the cost could be averaged out over a number of years. Experience has shown that the code tags have not lasted as long. Ms. Jacovella explained a code tag is a piece of equipment mounted on a vehicle, that contains the information from the hauler and is connected to the Region's Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System. This enables the haulers to enter the site without any manual intervention (there is a loop underneath the pavement that reads the code tag mounted on the vehicle) and to access the site on a 24 hour basis. As well, the code tag also operates the septage receiving facility so staff can track who disposed of what and who was on site; it is also used to track the waiting time for haulers on site and ensure the expected level of service is provided.

Councillor Hill noted the current disposal fee for Liquid Material is \$0.515 per 1,000 litres and asked what the cost would be for those within the sewer area. Ms. Jacovella advised the cost is \$0.495.

Councillor Hill then asked why the fee for the Special Discharge Agreement was being increased from \$500 to \$700. Ms. Jacovella replied \$700 is the actual cost. She noted it is a one time fee and not an annual fee. Ms. Schepers pointed out it is not the actual agreement that takes the time but rather it is the assessment of the material that is being discharged and the evaluation of the impact it will have on the infrastructure, on the process at the plant, on the effluent and on the biosolids. It is understanding what that material will do to the environment that takes the time and costs the money.

Councillor Hill had questions concerning consultation of the haulers. Ms. Jacovella noted the haulers had not been consulted on the fee changes. Ms. Schepers pointed out the Committee meeting was open to the public, the haulers were familiar with the Region's process (in terms of annually reviewing fees) and the item would have been advertised. Councillor Stewart stated the title of the report "The Regional Regulatory Code Rate Adjustments and Terminology Changes" was not a great indicator of the subject matter and doubted the haulers would have picked up on it..

Councillor Legendre referred to the Disposal Fee on page 19 and stated he recalled there being a lot of debate on the \$0.515 per 1000 litres; he asked staff to confirm that this fee is much lower than the actual cost. Ms. Schepers confirmed this fee does not reflect the actual cost. Ms. Jacovella advised in 1996 when these fees were first adopted the directive was that material generated outside the Regional Municipality would be charged at twice the actual cost and at the time the actual cost had been estimated at \$4.47 per thousand litres. Because WEPD costs have been reduced significantly since that time, she estimated the actual cost would be approximately \$3.50 per 1000 litres.

Councillor van den Ham had questions concerning the annual permit fee for the liquid waste and the code tags used. Ms. Jacovella explained in 1998, the Region spent \$2,300 replacing the code tags. The Councillor questioned why there would not be a one time fee and then only when the code tag apparatus needed changing, the individual haulers could be charged. Ms. Jacovella indicated the decision to have an annual permit fee was part of the overall hauled waste strategy. Responding to a further question from Councillor van den Ham, Ms. Jacovella advised a hauler would pay only one permit fee regardless of the number of trucks.

Councillor van den Ham noted although he did not like to see increases, he stated he believed to some extent in user pay. He said, given the Disposal fee for Liquid Material had remained unchanged (i.e. \$0.51 per 1000/litre) he would support the staff

recommendations because the increase in the permit fees reflected the actual cost to the Region.

Chair Stewart expressed real concern about the almost doubling of the Annual Permit fee, because there was no consultation or notification of the haulers. She indicated she could not support this fee increase, but otherwise commended staff for a very understandable report.

Councillor Hill indicated she would be putting forward a motion to reduce the increase to the Annual Permit fee from \$180 to \$140. Councillor Stewart stated she would support this recommendation and suggested the fee could then be raised to \$180 next year.

Responding to comments made by Chair Stewart and Councillor Bellemare, Ms. Schepers indicated if Councillor Hill's motion were approved, it would mean the program would continue to be subsidized by the rest of the users of the system (e.g. the liquid waste disposal fee of \$0.515 is already subsidized by the rest of the users).

Councillor Bellemare indicated the concern he was sensing from Committee members was with respect to the lack of consultation. He suggested when there are large increases in fees (i.e. greater than 10%), there should be a standing policy that public consultation automatically occurs vis-à-vis those particularly hit by that increase. Councillor Bellemare then indicated he would move such a motion.

Chair Stewart express support for such a motion as in her opinion it is often the lack of warning and the lack of consultation as opposed to the increase, that the public objects to. The Region will be left open to criticism that this is being done without openness and transparency.

Councillor Legendre indicated he would vote against such a change in the Annual Permit fee, as in his opinion a business facing an additional \$80 per year increase would not be greatly impacted. Councillor Legendre felt his fellow Councillors were overreacting.

Councillor van den Ham pointed out the Committee meeting was open to the public and people were free to address Committee, although he suggested the wording of the title could have been more clear. He said he would not support Councillor Bellemare's motion, as there is already a consultation policy at the Region. Speaking to Councillor Hill's motion, Councillor van den Ham indicated he would support the proposal to phase in the increase for the Annual Permit fee. He noted in the rural area, many of the haulers are very small operators.

Chair Stewart then asked Councillor Bellemare if he would accept, as a friendly amendment, the word "consultation" be substituted with the word "notification" and that

the words “unless impractical” be added to the end of the motion. Councillor Bellemare agreed to these changes.

Moved by M. Bellemare

That for any fee increase of 10% or more, targeted public notification occur automatically vis-à-vis those directly affected, unless impractical.

CARRIED
(J. Legendre and R. van den Ham
dissented)

Moved by B. Hill

That the Annual Permit Fee be increased to \$ 140 for 1999 for liquid waste disposal service.

CARRIED
(J. Legendre dissented)

There being no further discussion Committee then considered the recommendation as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve:

- 1. The adjusted rates and charges recommended in this report.**
- 2. The amended terminology changes.**
- 3. The new rates and charges recommended in this report.**
- 4. That the Regional Regulatory Code be amended to reflect the changes through an amending by-law.**
- 5. That the Annual Permit Fee be increased to \$ 140 for 1999 for liquid waste disposal service.**
- 6. That for any fee increase of 10% or more, targeted public notification occur automatically vis-à-vis those directly affected, unless impractical.**

CARRIED as amended

3. OTTAWA-CARLETON WATER QUALITY COMMITTEE SUMMER
WATER QUALITY AWARENESS TELEVISION CAMPAIGN

-Director, Water Environment Protection Division Environment and
Transportation Department report dated 13 May 1999

The Committee was shown a thirty second commercial (in both English and French) that will air over the summer on four local television stations. Nancy Schepers, A/Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, advised this commercial was developed a few years earlier but did not get a lot of air time then. She said for the Region's \$2000 contribution, this commercial will be aired 500 times from June to August, rotating between the four stations. She also noted the message at the end of the commercial (i.e. "Brought to you by the Region of Ottawa-Carleton...") will rotate on a random basis to indicate the other thirteen partners listed on page 27 of the Agenda (e.g. Brought to you by the City of Kanata..., Brought to you by the City of Gloucester..., etc.).

Responding to a query posed by Councillor Legendre, Gabriel Ahad, Coordinator, Communications and Customer Service, E&TD, indicated the four local stations that the commercial will air on are CJOH, CBOT, CHRO and CBOFT. He confirmed that CBOT was mentioned twice, in error.

Councillor Legendre suggested other stations the commercial could also air on, such as CHOT, CFJS, CIVO, TVO, TFO and community television channels. He expressed concern that the francophone audience would not be reached with the four stations mentioned in the report. He asked that staff revisit this.

With respect to the Ontario Government television stations (TVO and TFO), Ms. Schepers advised the campaign is a local one, specifically targetted for the Rideau and Ottawa Rivers. She agreed that staff would take the Councillor's suggestions as a direction to look at including all of the local french stations in the campaign.

Councillor Stewart commended staff for their leadership in this campaign and the wise use of \$2000. She expressed the hope that many more initiatives such as this, will be coming forward in the future..

Responding to questions posed by Councillor van den Ham, Ms. Schepers advised the message of the commercial is basically that each individual has a very important role to

play in water quality. It focuses on oil, lawn care products and pet waste and the impact these things have on water quality.

That Planning and Environment Committee receive this report and video presentation for information.

RECEIVED

INQUIRIES

Councillor Munter noted staff had provided (approximately six days earlier) information to members of Council concerning the potential garbage strike. He said there has since been conflicting information circulating and he asked that staff provide an update on this issue the next day at Council, with the opportunity for Councillors to ask questions of staff. Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, indicated staff would be able to provide Council with an update on the situation. He noted, to a large degree, this is a situation between the employer and the employees at Canadian Waste. Canadian Waste are obliged to continue to provide the service and they have provided the Region with some details as to how they intend to do this. He said many of these details are of a confidential nature and he suggested it would be best to provide the update to Council, In-Camera.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Original signed by Dawn Whelan

Original confirmed by Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR