

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

12 MAY 1998

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

Councillor Hume moved the minutes be amended on page 27, to add to the end of the 5th paragraph the following: "with no restrictions on the successful proponents to compete for subsequent phases." to better reflect the discussion.

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 28 April 98 as amended.

CARRIED as amended

POSTPONEMENTS / DEFERRALS

1. APPOINTMENTS TO THE LAND DIVISION COMMITTEE
- Acting Co-ordinator, P&E Committee report dated 28 Apr 98

Committee Chair Hunter brought to the attention of the Committee a letter from Janet Stavinga, Mayor, Township of Goulbourn, outlining the views of the Townships of Goulbourn, Rideau, Osgoode and West Carleton with respect to delegating the powers of the Regional Land Division Committee. (A copy is on file with the Regional Clerk.)

Nigel Brereton, Senior Project Manager, District 2, Development Approvals Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department (PDA) indicated he spoke to the Planning Director, Township of Goulbourn who had been selected by the Rural municipalities to bring forward a consolidated response on this issue. He indicated to Mr.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 27 May 98 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 7.

Brereton the Townships would like this issue to be deferred until it can be further studied, however, they are requesting the appointments to the Land Division Committee be approved in the meantime.

Councillor Hume, given the response from Mayor Stavinga, withdrew his motion to delegate the Regional Land Division Committee's powers to the Townships of Goulbourn, Rideau, Osgoode and West Carleton. Councillor Hume noted the Rural Alliance Report stated clearly they can put land division committee in with their existing committees of adjustment which each Township has, yet it would appear they are unable to do that. He felt in light of this he could not put much validity in the Rural Alliance Report and it gave him a better perspective on which to judge the new governance model, which allows the rural municipalities to opt in or out and whether they can actually deliver the services as they outlined them in their report.

Councillor Hill wished to note the Rural Alliance Report is meant to take effect when restructuring in Ottawa-Carleton occurs. She noted they would like to look at this issue as well as other issues as a group to provide the service to all four municipalities - one land division committee for all four.

There being no further discussion, the Committee considered the recommendation from Mr. Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, PDA's report dated 8 April 1998.

That the Planning and Environment Committee determine the most appropriate means of delivering the severance granting authority in Ottawa-Carleton, once the local government governance issue has been finalized.

CARRIED as amended

The Regional Clerk's Report dated 4 March 1998, recommending the appointments to the Land Division Committee, has been referred back to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee.

REGULAR ITEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

2. ASSUMPTION OF EAST BARRHAVEN TRUNK SANITARY SEWER
CITY OF NEPEAN

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 24 Apr 98

Mr. Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department (ETD) explained this policy and project dates from 1975 and is in accordance with Regional Council's policy as attached to the report. He added the specific project is noted in the 12 March 1975 report and the request from the City of Nepean came forward in August 1995. Mr. Sheflin believed this is the last assumption to be made under this program.

Councillor Legendre, referring to page 14 of the agenda where it states: "*The Township of Nepean have indicated that at the present time they intend to fund the sewer from current funds....they may have to finance some portion of the sewer.*" felt the text makes it clear the Region would be assuming the sewer debt free and asked if there is a Regional policy which indicates that infrastructure is assumed debt free.

Mr. Joe Vincelli, Manager, Engineering Services Branch, Engineering Division, ETD, noted he is unaware of any Regional policy that states the assumption of infrastructure is debt free. He informed the Councillor the practice has been through the 1970's and 1980's that the Region will pay the municipal debt, however, in the 1990's the practice has been that the Region will not assume the municipal debt, particularly with respect to roads.

Mr. Sheflin indicated the debt associated from the assumption of this sewer would be financed from the sewer surcharge, either locally, regionally or some form of combined charge.

Councillor Hill voiced her concern with assuming a debt this size, especially in light of recent reports from the City of Nepean which indicated they are debt free. She felt she could not support assuming this \$500,000 debt from the City.

Councillor Munter, noting that roads are no longer assumed with any debt, felt the same policy should apply when dealing with sewers. He requested the item be divided as he supported assuming the sewer, however, without the associated debt.

Councillor van den Ham agreed with the concerns of the other members of the Committee, however, he felt it is important that the Region live up to their commitment

made previously. He asked if the Region had, in the past, assumed other sewers with debt.

Mr. Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division, ETD, gave the following examples of sewers assumed by the Region with debt: South Woodroffe Trunk, \$630,000 in 1972; Viewmount Drive Trunk, \$425,000 in 1976; Graham Creek Trunk, \$1,000,000 in 1976; March Wood Trunk, \$200,000 in 1983; Bilberry Creek Sewage Treatment Plant, \$200,000 in 1977 and Watts Creek Sewage Treatment Plant \$600,000 in 1974.

Councillor Beamish did not feel the Region should assume the debt associated with this sewer and noted most of the examples cited above were from the 1970's. He asked if any sewers had been assumed more recently with debt.

Mr. Vincelli noted the March Wood Sewer Trunk was assumed in 1983 and he further pointed out that sewer infrastructure has been assumed debt free as recently as 1997. Mr. Vincelli also wished to note that Regional Council in the 1988 Capital Budget approved funds to pay the municipal debt associated with the assumption of this sewer.

Mr. Tim Marc, Solicitor, Legal Department pointed out to the Committee that although the recommendations are worded separately they cannot be divided; if the sewer is assumed by the Region, the debt must also be assumed as per the Regional Municipalities Act.

Committee Chair Hunter sympathized with the points made by Committee Members. He noted the report discusses the Trail Road Leachate Pipeline issue and questioned how the assumption of this sewer affects the pipeline.

Mr. Miller noted staff deferred the Trail Road Leachate issue, which was originally scheduled to be before Committee at this meeting, and explained that legally the Region is not required to assume this sewer in order to discharge into it.

Mr. Marc further pointed out the City of Nepean does not have to permit the Region to connect to this trunk sewer if the Region does not assume it, therefore, necessitating hauling leachate to the Pickard Centre.

Councillor Bellemare asked if a provision could be made, in light of the inability to divide the recommendation, to assume the sewer provided the City of Nepean continue to make the payments to address the issue of the debt associated with it. Mr. Marc confirmed this would be possible and explained the Region would become the primary debtor on the debenture but the City of Nepean would pay the funds to the Region and then the Region would pay the debt.

Committee Chair Hunter felt the main point is this is a local sewer whose debentures and maintenance are paid through the local sewer surcharge on the water rate. He noted Trail Road Landfill Site is not on local water and not paying this surcharge and will be paying approximately \$300,000 per year to truck leachate past many local sewer openings to the Picard Centre to be treated. This proposal could see a forcemain from Trail Road to the East Barhaven Sanitary Sewer to pipe the leachate at much less than \$300,000 a year each year. He questioned why the City of Nepean should allow the Region to hook into that sewer if Trail Road does not pay the local sewer surcharge on the water rate and the Region does not assume the sewer. Committee Chair Hunter felt in the long run if the Region will be proceeding with the leachate pipeline from Trail Road then assuming this sewer and the associated debt makes good business sense for the Region. He added if the Region wants to use the sewer, they will have to make it a Regional sewer and assume it under the expectations under which it was built.

Councillor van den Ham indicated his support of the staff recommendations and felt the Corporation's word is valuable and if the Region made the commitment to assume the sewer then the Region must live up to that. He also noted that approximately \$800,000 was identified and put aside in 1988, therefore, this is not an additional financial burden to the Region.

Mr. Sheflin commented that with respect to this assumption, he felt the Committee should honour the agreement made in 1975 as was the case with all other agreements made at that time even though the Region currently does not assume infrastructure with debt. He noted this was the last agreement from the 1970's and the Region does not enter into agreements such as this anymore.

Mr. Miller, in response to questions from Councillor Beamish, noted the approximate cost of the Trail Road Leachate Pipeline is 2 million dollars.

Councillor Beamish felt, in the end, the Committee should honour the agreement made in 1975 as were all other agreements made at that time and noted the 1975 report does not state the Region will assume the sewer once it is debt free. He agreed with the Committee Chair in that the City of Nepean could charge the Region to connect to the sewer with respect to the proposed leachate pipeline if it is not assumed by the Region.

Mr. Marc explained for Councillor Legendre that although the 1975 report does not actually state the Region would assume any associated debt, by operation of the Regional Municipalities Act assuming the sewer would automatically mean assuming the debt.

Mr. Marc, in response to Councillor Hill's question regarding imposing conditions on the City of Nepean that they not charge the Region for hooking into this sewer, he explained if the Region assumes the sewer the City will not be able to impose conditions.

Councillor Munter put forward a motion which states the Region will assume the sewer, but under the terms of the Regional Municipalities Act, the Region will bill back the City of Nepean to cover the associated debt.

There being no further discussion, the Committee then considered Councillor Munter's motion.

Moved by Councillor Munter

That Council approve the assumption of the East Barrhaven Trunk Sanitary Sewer, and require the City of Nepean to continue to make the payments to permit the discharge of the associated \$500,000. debt.

CARRIED

YEAS: M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, J. Legendre, A. Munter,
W. Stewart....6

NAYS: D. Beamish, G. Hunter, R. van den Ham....3

The Committee then carried the staff recommendation as amended with dissents noted.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the assumption of the East Barrhaven Trunk Sanitary Sewer per the request resolution of the City of Nepean, and require the City of Nepean to continue to make the payments to permit the discharge of the associated \$500,000.00 debt.

CARRIED as amended
(D. Beamish, G. Hunter and
R. van den Ham dissented.)

3. **DEVELOPMENT OF A CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION
WASTE DIVERSION INFRASTRUCTURE CREDIT POLICY**

- Director, Solid Waste Division, and Commissioner, Environment
and Transportation Department report dated 23 Apr 98

Mr. Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, ETD and Trish Johnson-Cover, Manager, Waste Diversion and Water Efficiency, Solid Waste Division, ETD, gave an overview of the staff report.

Mr. McNally confirmed in response to questions from Councillor Stewart that funding is available in the budget to support this pilot financial incentive program.

Councillor Beamish requested clarification regarding the meaning of establishing thresholds. Mr. McNally explained the Region's role with respect to waste management in Ottawa-Carleton is the consent process with recyclers, landfill operators, etc. He noted when staff initially dealt with the construction and demolition waste recycling area, they negotiated with different groups and, as much as was possible, maintained a level playing field. Staff started with a diversion rate of 85%, however, this rate is difficult to achieve. Staff felt through this policy there is the opportunity to bring the diversion to a reasonable level; possibly 60%.

In response to further questions from Councillor Beamish, Mr. McNally indicated if a diversion rate of 60% is achieved, then 40% will go to landfill and under the compensation program, the industry will pay \$10.00 per tonne for any material that goes to landfill. He added this program proposes to deal with those in the recycling business.

Mr. McNally explained for Councillor Legendre that it is illegal to take waste to Quebec to be dumped and it is also illegal for waste to be brought into Ontario from Quebec. He noted it is a requirement in most hauler's certificate of approval that waste must be disposed of in Ontario.

Councillor Legendre referring to page 19 of the report where it states: "*The diversion rate will be established based on a facility's incoming tonnage, waste stream composition, service area, material processing technology, and local end market conditions.*" felt there are too many variables and questioned who might participate.

Mr. McNally noted most of this information is readily available from the processors, usually in their certificate of approval from the Province, as well as the consent we enter into with them.

Councillor Stewart asked for clarification regarding the financial impact with respect to the Township of Osgoode and the consent fees.

Mr. McNally noted under the financial impact comment, the intent would be to bring recycling operations in the Township of Osgoode into this plan by requiring a fee on their consents which would basically provide a level playing field, for the entire Region. Staff, in discussions with Township of Osgoode staff, found this to be the best solution as Township staff were not willing to impose the same sort of conditions.

Sal Khan, Osgoode Recycling addressed the Committee. He felt the program as put forth is a good first step. He indicated his company operates a construction and demolition

waste recycling facility, however, due to market conditions, they could not operate during the first year as it was too costly to get the residuals to landfill. He noted they started operating almost a year ago in March with a low-tech, low-volume level which grew by the end of the summer to a larger volume. His company had to seek help and are now working with Tomlinson Environmental Services. The operation is now doing a pilot study with over a million dollars worth of equipment and are now working at a good efficient level. Mr. Khan wished to note it costs more money to operate such equipment and recycle than simply putting material in a hole in the ground.

Mr. Khan indicated in the Fall they would like to start a second pilot based on a lower volume and tech place, and if funding was available they will request participation in such a program. He noted the first project is underway and it would be inexpensive for the Region to participate in that program.

As a member of the Operating Committee for two years, Mr. Khan has been talking about many initiatives which can be taken by the Region, some of which are outlined in the report presented by staff. He felt in order to make construction and demolition waste recycling happen, diverting 100,000 tonnes, the following needs to be done: 1. Implementation of Ontario Regulation 10294, which requires any project over 200,000 metres square to do source separation or get involved in recycling; and 2. It is imperative to stop waste going to Quebec. He noted an initiative he proposed was to set up a pilot project to use the building permit process to control where the waste should go. A slip could be given to indicate where the waste went and the occupancy or completion permit would be issued upon receipt of the slip and the estimated amount of waste could be on the building permit; and 3. The greatest impediment to construction and demolition waste recycling is the vertically-integrated landfills. The fees at these landfills make it impossible to recycle. He noted recycling costs money and materials can be diverted, however, these three factors have to be addressed in order to make recycling work.

Mr. McNally said staff appreciate Mr. Khan's comments and are trying to move forward on number of issues, however, the bottom line is that many of these issues are beyond the Region's jurisdiction. He acknowledged that waste is going to Quebec and he has had discussions with Provincial staff who indicate their resources have been cut and there are other priorities at the moment.

He noted with respect to the building permit process, MOE and Regional staff, along with Mr. Khan, formed a sub committee to look into it. They are in the process of putting together a flyer talking about the proper disposal of waste, which will be forwarded to municipalities building permit section, asking if there is an interest in adding this requirement to that process to monitor waste more closely.

With respect to vertically-integrated landfills, Mr. McNally indicated that is where some of the private sector is and the Region does not have the ability to do much in this area. He noted the policy attempts to address this, as, if the residuals are kept to a minimum, then at least some of that money will end up back in recyclers hand and to make it more attractive than landfill.

Mr. Khan suggested the Trail Road Landfill Site could also give incentives to recycle to those who are recycling to the best of their abilities. If the report talks about percentages, a lot of the stuff is heavy and cannot be recycled. There is no facility to recycle drywall or asphalt shingles in Ottawa-Carleton. He suggested Trail Road offer a preferable rate to recycling facilities if they are unable to get a good rate at a private landfill.

In response to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Khan indicated the \$10.00 fee would help, however, he felt the three issues noted above need to be addressed.

Mr. McNally, in response to Councillor Legendre's question as to why the Region would not welcome garbage from Quebec, indicated that the Region will continue to preserve landfill capacity for residents and businesses of Ottawa-Carleton. He noted that discussions have taken place with MOE staff in the Ottawa office regarding this issue, however staff have not been in contact with the Quebec ministry. He added a number of years ago in discussions with Quebec ministry staff, they have the same problems as Ontario in that they have limited resources and other priorities.

Mr. McNally further pointed out the Trail Road Landfill Site receives mostly residential waste, therefore, Quebec trucks attempting to dump construction and demolition waste at Trail Road is not an issue. Mr. Khan noted it is not a common practice to see Quebec trucks dumping in Ottawa-Carleton as it is less expensive to dump in Quebec.

Councillor Legendre asked Mr. Khan if the same rules would not apply to vertically as opposed to horizontally integrated landfills.

Mr. Khan explained that trucking costs \$150. per trip to take a box to landfill (standard trucking charge) and if the vertically integrated landfills offered a service of picking up the box and dumping it at a cost of \$380. plus GST and they pay \$150. trucking they are left with \$230. for the cost of the material. A 30 yard container averages 8 tonnes of material. The compensation fee will pay you \$80. for that box of landfill. At those costs how can a recycling facility compete when they will charge \$500 for the same box.

There being no further questions of Mr. Khan the committee Chair thanked the speaker for his comments.

Committee Chair Hunter felt more regulations should come forward as the program progresses. He felt what is in the report is too broad and does not show how it will impact the industry. He requested staff come back with more details as the project unfolds.

The Committee Chair also felt the recommendations could be amended to add some of Mr. Khan's points regarding stronger efforts to stop waste diversion from going to Quebec, which undercuts the Ontario market, and the issue of implementing at-source recycling in larger projects, by way of local building permits.

Mr. Sheflin noted it would have to be by way of a request to the MOE and the area municipalities.

In response to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. McNally explained with respect to lower rates, recyclers will thrive if costs come down or if revenues go up, however, he felt lowering the tipping fee at Trail Road Landfill Site would be the wrong way to go. He noted one of purposes of the report that staff would like to achieve, is to send the message to the construction and demolition waste industry that there is something coming to continue to support their operations.

Mr. Sheflin added one of the problems with reducing the fees at the landfill site results in trans shipping materials through the waste recycling facility that the haulers knows cannot be recycled, but will attract a lower rate when sent to landfill. He noted it is better to give incentives on the revenue end of it.

Councillor van den Ham noted that although the impression is that the review is onerous, the principles sound good and he will be supporting the proposal if it is workable and agreeable to the industry.

Councillor Beamish requested staff provide Members of the Committee with a few of the agreements (as was done with certificate of approvals) as the program unfolds to see how they come out and if they are achieving the 60% thresholds.

Councillor Hill asked if anything else was being done to encourage waste diversion of other types of materials i.e. government organizations and school boards dumping chairs, tables, etc.

Mr. McNally noted Trail Road operates as a landfill site with the main focus being the residential waste program. He noted there are no other formal programs with respect to waste diversion.

Councillor Legendre introduced a motion to address the issue to waste being trucked to Quebec.

Moved by J. Legendre

That staff consult with the area municipalities concerning making the issuance of permits conditional on certificates indicating appropriate disposal and recycling.

CARRIED

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

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the Solid Waste Division staff policy to provide a pilot financial incentive program to encourage construction and demolition waste diversion in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (RMOC) and staff consult with area municipalities concerning making issuance of permits conditional on certificates indicating appropriate disposal and recycling.

CARRIED as amended

PLANNING ITEMS

4. ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD
DUNROBIN LAKES SUBDIVISION
WEST CARLETON OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 61
ZONING BY-LAW 18/97

- Regional Solicitor's and Planning and Development Approvals
Commissioner's joint report dated 27 Apr 98

Mr. Marc outlined the reasons staff would like to support the request for a rehearing are, the comments made by and Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) member with respect to the Regional Growth Strategy for Rural Development and the approach taken by an OMB member with respect to hydrogeology.

Councillor Legendre asked if normally, with respect to an OMB decision, if the appellants feel the Board made the wrong decision they would pursue it in the courts.

Mr. Marc explained when the decision was released, the appellant could have gone to court on a question of law, but in this case, it is really not legal issues that caused this

decision to be wrong, it is the factual and policy approach taken by a member of the Board. He noted he supports Mr. Cohen in his request and felt it is an appropriate one.

Councillor Legendre indicated he was uncomfortable with this and did not feel Regional interest was sufficient to support West Carleton in their request. He disagreed as this calls into question the Region's practice regarding rural growth and hydrogeological studies. He felt in reading the material the Board member is indicating the Region is not doing their job and he agreed. He noted he would not be supporting this recommendation.

Councillor Hume, referring to the letter from Soloway, Wright Barristers and Solicitors, indicated his support of the request for a rehearing based on the inappropriate comments made by a member of the OMB. Councillor Hill agreed and felt the Region should be defended on this issue.

Councillor Bellemare requested the cost of adding the Region as a party to this request from West Carleton. He noted under financial implications, costs are estimated for materials to be \$500-1000. He asked for staff to identify staff time for this.

Mr. Marc noted it is a two-step process: appearing before the Board on the motion to rehear and then, if accepted, appearing before the Board for the rehearing. He felt both would take approximately 5 to 6 days of staff time. Mr. Marc's estimated his time would cost approximately \$2,500, however, he was unable to estimate other staff's involvement and costs.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend to Regional Council that the Region support the Township of West Carleton in its request to the Ontario Municipal Board for a rehearing on O.P.A. 61, West Carleton Zoning By-law 18 of 97 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 06T-94001.

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented.)

5. SUBDIVISIONS - CLYDE / MERIVALE
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 29 Apr 98

Councillor Stewart noted that delegated authority had been removed to ensure the Stormwater Treatment Pond, which was part of a draft agreement, be built and installed. She now understood that a letter of credit has been received for the entire pond.

Mr. Marc noted a certified cheque for \$280,000. from Ashcroft has been received and the balance of the cost is held in a letter of credit at the City of Ottawa. The City has provided a letter of undertaking that if Region needs to call upon the certified cheque, the City will cooperate and call upon the letter of credit to ensure the pond is built. He confirmed for Councillor Stewart the City could not use the cheque for any other purpose as that would be in violation of the agreement with Ashcroft.

Councillor Stewart noted the report states the pond is expected to be constructed in the 1998 construction season and inquired if the detailed design work had been prepared yet.

Mr. Marc introduced Mr Moffat, Consultant, Cumming Coburn who indicated they are in the process of preparing a plan and detailed designs in accordance with the Region's concerns and confirmed the pond should be built this year.

With respect to Transportation Phase 1b, Councillor Stewart noted the report reads Ashcroft provide full security for the works on the roads prior to registration of Phase 1b and questioned if that has been completed.

Mr. Marc responded that works that have to be done for Phase 1 are on the north side of Central Park Drive and the Region has received the security to guarantee construction of those works from Ashcroft last week. He added an agreement with hydro has been reached allowing the hydro cable work, which must be done at the same time as the traffic signalization work.

Councillor Stewart wished to commend staff for their hard work and put forward a motion that no registration of any phase, subsequent to Phase 1b, be allowed prior to ensuring the first phase be operational and acceptable.

Moved by W. Stewart

That no registration of any phase, subsequent to Phase 1b, be permitted until the Stormwater Treatment Pond is built and functioning to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton.

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation as amended.

That Planning and Environment Committee revise its direction made with respect to the Clyde/Merivale lands at the meeting of 9 September 1997 to permit the registration of Phase 1B provided Ashcroft Development Inc. has filed letters of credit for the full value of the stormwater pond prior to Planning and Environment Committee on 12 May 1998 as amended by the following:

That no registration of any Phase subsequent to Phase 1B be permitted until the Stormwater Treatment Pond is built and functioning to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton.

CARRIED as amended

INQUIRIES

Councillor Hume noted the ongoing proposals that relate to the Chaudiere Falls and inquired if the dam was modified or removed how would it affect the Region's water filtration plants that draw on the basin created by the dam.

Mr. Sheflin indicated there are two aspects to this: whether the dam is removed or whether it stays and is modified. He noted if the dam is removed there is a hundred year eco-system built up in that area and it will require millions of dollars to study and examine all of those aspects and do an extensive review of the proposal. If the dam is to be cleaned and left there, the costs would decrease considerably.

Mr. Andre Proulx, Director, Water Division, ETD noted that if the dam is removed it would have an enormous effect on the Region's water supply. The water intake would have to be removed and rebuilt upstream.

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. Recycling Council of Ontario - Draft Consultation Report on Blue Box Funding
- Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and Transportation Department
memorandum dated 7 Apr 98
(Originally listed on P&EC Agenda of 28 Apr 98)

2. Implementing RMOC's 20% Club Commitment to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's memorandum dated 20 Apr 98
(Originally listed on P&EC Agenda of 28 Apr 98)

3. 1998 Water Distribution System Rehabilitation Program
- Director, Engineering Division, Environment and Transportation Department
memorandum dated 23 Apr 98

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR