

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Referring to page 13, on the issue of the protection of wetlands, Councillor Stewart clarified she felt if beaver-created wetlands are to be protected, it could lead to a situation where landowners would be prevented from the necessary control of beavers to protect their land. She asked that the minutes be amended to reflect this.

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 14 May 1996 as amended.

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

1. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 62 - PROPOSED CARLSBAD SPRINGS WATER SUPPLY SERVICE AREA - ADDITION OF PART OF RUSSELL ROAD AND PART OF BASELINE ROAD
- Planning and Property Commissioner and Environment and Transportation Commissioner's joint report dated 06 May 96

Councillor Stewart stated she understood a deadline for funding from the Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA) was imminent, and Council would have to approve the application in order to access funding. She noted the Region was still being financed 70% through the Provincial Grant, and asked whether there was a problem with timelines in getting the approval in. Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division, replied the Region

had met the commitment for overall project funding, as Council had approved the purchase of the pipe prior to the deadline. He said the amendment before Committee was to add approximately 10% in length and 5% in number of units to the project. He noted discussions with OCWA were ongoing and this was why the report recommended it be subject to their approval. Mr. Miller stated it is staff's belief that the subject land is within the study area, but this has yet to be resolved. He confirmed the funding was secured for the overall project, and the recommendation would not jeopardize funding amounts.

Referring to page 3 of the staff report, Councillor Stewart noted "little or no oversizing is required", and asked if costs would increase if oversizing were required. Mr. Miller replied there would be a cost increase to incrementally increase pipe size. However, Mark Surtees, Project Manager, Water Facility Projects Branch, added the connection point for Baseline Road extension north would not require additional oversizing in the feedermain.

Committee Chair Hunter noted Susan Burnett-Roy, a resident of Carlsbad Springs, had indicated her agreement with the staff recommendation and wished to speak to the matter only if there was opposition to it. Ms. Burnett-Roy confirmed this. The Chair then asked if anyone else was present who wished to speak to this matter. There being no further speakers, the Committee then considered the staff recommendations.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Approve, having held a public meeting, Regional Official Plan Amendment 62 as attached in Annex A;**
- 2. Subject to recommendations 1, direct staff to include the servicing area described in the Regional Official Plan Amendment 62 into the Carlsbad Springs Water Supply project subject to Ministerial approval and project funding limit.**

CARRIED

2. CITY OF OTTAWA COMPREHENSIVE OFFICIAL PLAN
RESOLUTION OF DEFERRAL NO. 18 - OTTAWA CIVIC
HOSPITAL, RUSKIN STREET PARKING LOT

- Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 24 Apr 96

Councillor Legendre asked staff for an update of the issue, as he believed this report represented a complete change of position by the Community Association, the City of Ottawa and the Civic Hospital. Nigel Brereton, Manager, Plans Administration Division, stated the Region had not been a party to any of the negotiations, and could provide no information other than letters from the hospital, the president of the community association, and the City of Ottawa's Commissioner of Planning, Economic Development and Housing stating that an agreement on new wording had been reached.

Mr. Ray Essiambre, a trustee of the Civic Hospital and Chairman of the Task Force on Parking, offered that although the issue had once been controversial, it was no longer. The turnaround resulted from discussions with the community association, where it was learned the primary concern was the parking lot would eventually be developed by the hospital for future expansion. The hospital however, has made it clear it has no such plan, and an agreement was reached which preserves the parking lot to service the Heart Institute's patients. Mr. Bob Spicer, a Senior Planner with the City of Ottawa, who represented the City in the process and acted as mediator between the Civic Hospital and the community, confirmed it had taken approximately a year of negotiations to arrive at this compromise, and that the community had been looking for stability and an assurance that the next 30 years would not bring hospital expansion to the subject land.

Responding to a question from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Spicer confirmed a change of zoning would be required if the hospital wished to redevelop the parking lot, as the

current use was limited to a City-owned parking lot or other public uses. Mr. Essiambre added that if this Official Plan Amendment (OPA) wording were approved, another OPA would be required to allow construction on the site. Mr. Spicer added that without this policy in place, another Official Plan Amendment would not be required.

The Councillor also asked whether the departmental recommendation was flawed in that it stated "...the period of the usage is for not *less* than 30 years...", which seemed to imply that the agreement had no ceiling, and that the wording should probably read "...not *more* than 30 years...". Mr. Spicer said that in the course of negotiations, the community had requested a longer period of time, but 30 years was a compromised minimum, after which time, a reevaluation process could be undertaken. Mr. Spicer clarified that if the community could not have a park, they would rather have a parking lot that would not expand, rather than a building.

Councillor Legendre noted he had tried to contact the Ward Councillor for the City for explanations and had been unable to do so. Mr. Essiambre indicated that Councillor Joan Wong was a member of the Civic Hospital Board of Trustees, as well as a member of City Council, and has been kept informed of this matter.

Councillor Cullen expressed his surprise at the modified wording and felt the issue had never been one of community opposition to future development of the parking lot, but rather a question of reverting the parking lot to the park it once was. The Councillor said the original deal worked out between the hospital President and the City of Ottawa C.A.O., had been agreed upon by City Council but was unacceptable to the Board of Trustees. The deal offered at the time was to move the parking back onto the street, so that the hospital would retain the same number of parking spots, and the City would regain half to two-thirds of the land area that the community wanted to revert to its original use as a park.

Councillor Cullen asked Mr. Spicer whether this proposed modification had gone through a public hearing process at the City of Ottawa. Mr. Spicer replied it had not. The Councillor expressed his discomfort with the process given the history of the issue, as the community was not going to regain parkland it felt it was owed, and he felt this OPA, which had not undergone the public hearing process, was simply before Committee to validate the hospital's usage of the land.

Councillor Hill pointed out this was not a Regional issue. She noted all parties had agreed to the proposal, and it was not Committee's place to question the decision.

Committee Chair Hunter reminded Committee that its position was one of an approving authority, and he urged members to approve the lifting of the deferral and the amended wording worked out between authorities of the City of Ottawa, the Civic Hospital, and the neighbouring communities.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that as stipulated on the Approval page attached as Annex A, Council lift Deferral No. 18 to the City of Ottawa Official Plan, 1991; delete the pertinent text and introduce by modification the following text:

“To ensure that the use of the City-owned lands on the north side of the Civic Hospital (bounded by Ruskin, Reid, Hutchison and MacFarlane) which was originally taken over by the City of Ottawa as open space, is limited to a surface parking lot of not more than 270 parking stalls and the adjoining green space, all in existence as of 1995. The lot is primarily for the use of Civic Hospital patients and visitors.

The period of the usage is for not less than 30 years, beginning in 1995. The Hospital will continue to monitor its parking operations and will assess all other options for the supply of parking facilities appropriate to the demands which it faces during this time period. Subsequent to this time period, the use of these lands as a park will be re-evaluated. Area residents, the local community association, the City and the Civic Hospital are to be included as participants in the re-evaluation.”

CARRIED

(A. Cullen and J. Legendre
dissented)

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

3. WATER ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION DIVISION

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

- Director, Water Environment Protection Division report dated 10 May 96
- Annex B; Discussion Papers on file with the Regional Clerk

Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division, provided the Committee with an overview of the staff report. At the conclusion of Ms. Schepers' presentation, Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, noted that nothing in the staff report indicates that the project is not possible. There are risks that Council should be aware of but it is staff's intention to proceed with the process.

Councillor Beamish noted the report speaks of staff submitting a proposal. He pointed out that private companies will be required to provide a bond or letter of credit to ensure they perform the work for a specified amount of money; he asked what guarantees staff will offer. Mr. Sheflin explained that staff will not be submitting a bid but rather, in order to evaluate the bids, Council will have to know what the proposed cost is. He noted that the Water Environment Protection Division (WEPD) is an unusual situation; normally, one would take an activity, inflate it and add on the extra volume, population etc. WEPD is in a situation where the cost is steadily decreasing and therefore Council will have to know what amount to compare the proposals

against. Ms. Schepers added staff will prepare a budget and commit to meeting those numbers. She noted that WEPD has been delivering for less than the budget over the last few years, while at the same time assuming more of the operation of the plant.

Councillor Cullen, referring to the section in the report on Human Resources Principles, asked if the cost for vested obligations (i.e. \$3 million to \$5 million) will be used when evaluating private sector bids. He noted this would not be a cost the Region would assume if the operation of WEPD were to remain with the Region. Ms. Schepers acknowledged that this would be recognized as a one time cost and assessed in the evaluation. Staff are recommending the amount be spread out over an appropriate term to fairly compare public and private dollar amounts.

Responding to questions from Councillor Cullen concerning contractual obligations with CUPE 503, Joyce Potter, Commissioner, Human Resources, advised that the language of the contract indicates the Region will not contract out if such contracting out would result in a layoff or reduction of hours for any member. However, it goes on to say that contracting out to an employer who is party to a collective agreement and who would employ the members of the bargaining unit would not be a violation of the contract. Ms. Potter felt the last sentence of this clause “opens the door”, as long as the Region meets these two obligations of the agreement.

Councillor Cullen, on the issue of credibility of the process, asked what the Peer Review Committee’s opinion of using the staff proposal as a benchmark for private sector proposals was. Ms. Schepers advised that this issue was not discussed with the Peer Review Committee. She noted that staff recognize this aspect does complicate the process somewhat but believe it is doable. It has been done successfully in the past and although staff have not finalized all of the details of how it will be assessed, their intention is to ensure an objective assessment. Councillor Cullen commented he feels the onus will be on staff (assumed to have the “inside track”), as the credibility of the bids will be heavily scrutinized.

In response to Councillor Legendre, Ms. Potter advised that of the 126 employees of WEPD, 103 are members of CUPE 503, 8 are members of CUPE 2187, 9 are members of CIPP and 6 are in the management/exempt group. In the functions that staff are proposing to retain (policy development and by-law enforcement) there are approximately 10 to 12 individuals; these individuals would be from all bargaining units but a higher percentage would be from CUPE 2187 and CIPP.

Councillor Legendre noted that CUPE 503 had been approached on the possibility of the private sector being a successor, as in the sale of business. He asked if this would save the Region the \$3 million to \$5 million in vested obligations. Commissioner Potter responded that Hamilton-Wentworth provides a good example of what a successor arrangement could look like. Negotiations were held between the union, private contractor and the region to arrange for all of the employees, along with their existing collective agreement, to be taken on by the private contractor. If, in the RMOC’s case, the private contractor were willing to take over all of the existing collective agreements and the obligations associated with them, the Region most likely

would need to transfer the money associated with these obligations (banked sick leave, vacation leave, pensions, etc.) to the contractor. Although severance would not have to be paid up front by the Region to the employee, the obligation to pay severance in the event of the employees losing their jobs would go to the contractor and it would be expected that a contractor would seek some remuneration to compensate for this.

Councillor Legendre noted the section on Contract Security did not contain a governing principle. He expressed his support for the ideas stated, i.e. an amended performance bond giving authority to the RMOC to approve a substitute contractor and also a letter of credit. He asked staff why these concepts were not incorporated into a guiding principle. Geoff Cantello, Solicitor, Regional Legal Department, explained that amended performance bonds are not necessarily available; although staff would proceed in the direction of obtaining such a bond, there is no guarantee it will be attainable. He noted a letter of credit would definitely be required. Councillor Legendre indicated his intent to put forward a motion to include these items as a guiding principle.

Referring to governing principles 7 and 12, Councillor Legendre sought assurance that the costs to the RMOC to monitor the performance of a private sector contractor, would be included in one of these principles. Ms. Schepers advised that this was implied in Principle 12; cost impacts include monitoring costs and cost savings that other departments may realize as a result of this.

Councillor Legendre felt the amortization period referred to in Principle 5 should be specified. Ms. Schepers stated that staff do not yet have sufficient information to recommend an appropriate term but the term will be established prior to the Request for Proposals (RFP). She noted the Peer Review Committee felt the period should be appropriate to allow for a fair comparison of the public and private proposals.

Responding to Councillor Legendre's questions on capital improvements, Kent Kirkpatrick, Deputy Treasurer and Director, Financial Services Division, noted that under the compensation model being proposed, capital costs would be considered flow through. There will be three components to the private sector bid: the fixed bid, variable costs and flow through costs. Those flow through costs would not be considered relevant in a comparison between the private sector bid and the in-house proposed budget.

Councillor Legendre suggested an outside committee or firm be retained to undertake the evaluation of the proposals, so that Council will receive an unbiased assessment. Ms Schepers noted that a consultant will be retained to assist in the development of the RFP and Requests for Qualifications (RFQ) and staff will seek advise to ensure the comparison is credible and transparent. As well, the Regional Internal Auditor will assist Environment and Transportation staff in terms of ensuring the comparability and reasonableness of the staff proposal. Ms. Schepers went on to say that, although all of the details have not been refined, staff recognize this as an important issue and are sensitive to this. It is also staff's contention to continue to use the Peer Review Committee at key stages in the process and would envision going to that committee

with a proposal on how staff propose to undertake the evaluation and receive their feedback.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter regarding Principle 7, Mr. Cantello advised that monitoring by the Region would be necessary, because under the relevant legislation, the Region cannot absolve itself from all guilt simply by contracting out an operation. As the owner of the facility, the Region must ensure that whoever is operating it is conducting themselves in accordance with that legislation.

Councillor Munter commented that the report appears to centre on the protection of the asset but the much more important aspect of the protection of the environment and human health is only fleetingly referenced. He felt this should constitute part of the evaluation; there should be a record of the bidders' history on the basis of protection of environment and human health and their experience in environmental technology. Ms. Schepers advised that Principle 4 governs this aspect; as well, referring to the WEPD mission statement, staff envision continuing to provide leadership in the protection of water environment. She noted that in terms of the evaluation, the Region is looking for the best value for its money and this will not be based on cost assessment alone. Councillor Munter stated he would be moving a motion to spell this out more clearly.

Councillor Munter asked that he be provided with material on other jurisdictions' experiences in this type of venture, both good and bad, prior to this matter being considered by Council. Ms. Schepers agreed to provide the Councillor with examples from both inside and out of Canada.

Ms. Potter, responding to questions from Councillor Munter, concerning non-CUPE 503 employees, advised that staff are recommending the contractor be encouraged to offer employment to all other employees in the other groups. However, without a specific requirement in a collective agreement, the Region cannot force the issue. Ms. Potter pointed out that staff of WEPD are extremely well qualified and many of the positions in the professional category are very specialized. She commented it would be in the contractor's best interest to take on those staff and offer them employment should they wish to take it. All categories of employees, should they not accept employment with the contractor, are subject to the normal Regional workforce adjustment policy and will be provided with career counseling, employee assistance programs and opportunities to try to identify appropriate employment for them elsewhere in the Region.

Councillor Stewart asked who the members of the Peer Review Committee are. Ms. Schepers advised there are two local businessmen, Mike Darch, President of REDO and Steve Simmering of Simmering & Associates, a local consultant. As well, there is the Chief Administrative Officer of York Region, a Commissioner from Halton Region, Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation and Garry Armstrong, Commissioner, Homes for the Aged. One other member who will attend future meetings is André Lortie, President of Cité Collegiale. In response to questions from Councillor Stewart concerning the private sectors' response to this report, Ms. Schepers stated staff had not actively sought the private sectors' input into this report

as they wanted to ensure it was fair and equitable. For this reason, staff sought unbiased feedback from local businesses and other municipalities that have been through this process. Staff will however, be seeking the private sector's input, in a formalized fashion, on the technical details of the RFP.

Councillor van den Ham asked what the exact cost for the severance portion of the \$3 million to \$5 million cost for vested obligations, would be. Ms. Potter advised that a calculation of the total vested obligations, based on today's entitlements and the existing complement of staff, would be a total of \$3.9 million; of this, \$2.6 million would be separation payment. She cautioned the Committee that these costs would increase by the time the actual contracting out occurs in the next year or two. Councillor van den Ham suggested the portions of sick leave, vacation and overtime not be included in the calculation, as the Region is responsible for them whether it contracts out or not. The Councillor also felt the cost of the monitoring function (Principle 7) should not be used in the cost comparison of public versus private sector proposals.

Referring to Principle 14, Councillor van den Ham felt a maximum of three respondents would not provide the Region with any flexibility; it would be best to maintain flexibility so that four or even five very suitable proposals can be entertained. He also noted the transparency of the process is very important and suggested the consultant (to be retained) take the lead role in the review of the proposals. Ms. Schepers acknowledged this could very well be appropriate however, as staff are not certain this is the best way to do this, she was reluctant to recommend it. She advised that staff would explore this aspect further and determine how best to evaluate it in an objective manner.

Committee Chair Hunter noted some of the principles could very severely drive the technical details. He referred to the point raised by Councillor van den Ham regarding the issue of a maximum of three respondents and asked for staff's comment on this. Mr. Sheflin advised this matter had been discussed with the Peer Review Committee and a range of 3 or 4 was suggested. The main reason for limiting the number of respondents is the preparation of the proposal is a very expensive. The fewer the number of respondents who qualify to submit a bid, the greater the chance of winning the contract. It was not staff's intention to arbitrarily cut off the number of qualified bidders at three; if staff is unable to discern between the third and the fourth bidder, they would come back to the Committee for direction. Chair Hunter suggested it might be better if the Principle were worded "a range of three to five respondents be retained for the RFP stage".

In response to questions from Councillor Hunter concerning Principle 3 (the business units) Ms. Schepers explained that staff are recommending it be structured into six business units and the respondents would be asked to provide a proposal for each of the units. These would then be considered and there is the potential to award the different business units to different respondents, except in the case of wastewater treatment and collection which would have to go to one operator. There is also the

potential that staff may recommend a combination of private and public operation of some of the units.

In response to questions from Chair Hunter concerning Principle 5 (vested obligations), Mr. Kirkpatrick replied if the Region were to continue to operate WEPD, these payments (i.e. sick leave, vacation, etc.) would be made over a period of time. It would be necessary to take an actuarial evaluation and compare this to the fact the Region will be paying out these costs in the near term under privatization. The difference between the net present value of those two streams will be the cost that would have to be debited against the private sector bid (i.e. the interest costs that would be forgone by paying out now as compared to over a period of time, would need to be considered in the evaluation of the private sector bid). Mr. Kirkpatrick went on to say that although it is true the Region would not be accruing additional liabilities in terms of vested sick leave, etc., the costs associated with these obligations would be borne by the successful private sector operator and would likely find their way into the fixed component of the bid.

Ms. Schepers confirmed, at Councillor Hunter's request that the proposed compensation strategy (Principle 8) poses the highest risk to the Region but provides the potential for the lowest cost. She explained that if all the risk fell to the private sector, then the fixed cost would reflect all of these risks (even if they do not occur).

Councillor Beamish asked if the \$200,000 capital expenditure will cover the whole process. Ms. Schepers advised a report will be considered by Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee on the assignment of a consultant and this amount will include everything up to the evaluation. She added however, there is not enough money in the budget and the report recommends some additional funds be transferred out of Environment and Transportation's operating budget to cover the difference. The entire evaluation process will cost approximately \$300,000.

Councillor Legendre asked what would happen if the operation were contracted out to the private sector and for some reason the venture failed or if at the end of the contract the Region chose not to renew. The Region would have paid out severance, etc. and then after the failure, the staff become RMOC employees again. Commissioner Potter explained that staff are trying to provide Council with advise that would avoid the whole thing being deemed a disaster; a portion of that is complying with the obligations of the collective agreements. She noted that should the Region find itself in a position of dealing with a contractor that failed to meet its obligations, this would be a legal matter. Ms. Potter pointed out in the past, the Region has found itself in the position of paying out severance to laid-off employees and then rehiring them at some point in the future.

Bill Burrows and Mark Sanderson on behalf of PSG Mr. Burrows stated he had received a copy of the staff report on Friday and the discussion papers on Monday and, he explained this was not sufficient time to review these documents in detail. He asked that the Committee defer consideration of this matter.

Mr. Sanderson noted that PSG is the largest private operator of municipally owned water and wastewater treatment facilities in North America. He reminded members that PSG had previously operated the biosolids facility at ROPEC and noted that he feels strongly that privatization works. Having reviewed the report and discussion papers to the extent possible, he offered comments on a few items including issues of communication, risk management and bonding.

Mr. Sanderson stated the report and discussion papers did an excellent job of discussing the myriad of issues that had to be addressed. He was pleased to see the process moving forward and he expressed support for the work that has been done thus far. The speaker felt it very important in the initial stages, that the framework clearly define objectives and communicate specifically how the process will be managed and undertaken.

With regard to the procurement process outlined on page 14 of the report, Mr. Sanderson disagreed with staff's contention that the prohibition of meetings or discussions would prevent undue influence in the process. PSG feels an open process that encourages discussion and exchange of ideas, up until the actual procurement process starts, is more likely to result in a better and more accountable process. He agreed that no contact should be made with staff or elected officials once the RFQ or RFP is called; however, to deny access to the public once this report is approved could result in less innovative bids.

The speaker felt that additional guiding principles should be added, specifically relating to maintenance risks and additional costs related to flow throughs. He felt the discussion around costs and flow throughs was confusing and he stated he would be pleased to discuss his proposed additional guiding principles with staff at their convenience.

Mr. Sanderson expressed concern with the concept of breaking down the proposal into business units. He stated this creates enormous problems for potential bidders who must develop a proposal for the overall operation of the plant and also for each individual business unit. The goal of privatization is to save the taxpayer dollars while protecting public facilities; economies of scale cannot be realized through smaller operating units.

With respect to the cost to the RMOC for contract liabilities and labour issues, Mr. Sanderson felt more work is needed to be done by staff to clarify the actual costs. On the issue of contract security and risk management, the speaker noted the report's approach is to require amended performance bonds and to micro-manage details associated with maintenance and termination. He cautioned the Committee that each condition applied to the bidders (such as an amended bond or termination for no cause) increases the cost to manage the facility.

Mr. Sanderson felt the timeline for the process is too long; there is no reason the target date of January 1997 cannot be realized with cooperation from staff and a more open process. He also suggested that at certain times in the process (i.e. when the RFQ is

documented and prior to the issuance of the RFP), staff should report back to Council for approval and to allow for comment in a public arena. He felt this should be added to the guiding principles.

With respect to the staff bid, Mr. Sanderson felt the report was not clear on how it will be handled. As well, he felt there should be some budget analysis on direct and indirect costs. For example, if there is going to be a cost associated with administering a contract charged against the operator, then the Region should take into account its current costs associated with management, payroll, legal, human resources, etc.

Mr. Burrows stated he had grave difficulties with the Peer Review Committee, in that Regional staff were part of it. With regard to the business units, he felt that because staff are recommending the treatment and collection of wastewater be handled by the same operator, these should then be considered as one unit. Further, he pointed out that having two or three contractors operating the facility, will lead to many difficulties.

The speaker noted he had serious difficulty with the precedent method staff relied upon in the report; the two operations (solid waste and WEPD) are hugely different and the process may or may not be relevant to how this particular privatization is achieved.

With regard to prequalification of proponents, Mr. Burrows expressed his support; however he felt there should not be an absolute limit on the number of qualifiers. He noted the major expense is in preparing a proposal; the respondents can decide after they have qualified whether they wish to proceed with a proposal. Mr. Sanderson added that it is common in the industry to utilize a point scoring system (measure corporate experience, technical capability, etc.) and evaluate on the basis of anyone within 10% of the most qualified would be on the short list.

Referring to the “termination without cause” issue, Mr. Burrows felt this would be a “non-starter” for the industry. This is a huge contract and no sensible, cautious business person in the private sector would enter into a contract of this size and complexity that can be terminated without cause on 90 days notice. He stated that no one in the industry could afford to bid against the Region, building into their bid what they would have to in order to cover themselves for the possibility of termination without cause.

Mr. Burrows felt many issues, such as human resources, due diligence, monitoring and supervision, should be looked at in more detail. On the issue of performance bonds, he expressed doubt the type of bond staff are recommending would be attainable. If it were possible and the Region did require such a bond, it would have a very substantial cost involved and again, the private sector would be unable to compete with the staff proposal.

Councillor Stewart asked Mr. Burrows if the Peer Review Committee had managed to satisfy him that the industry’s interests had been served. Mr. Burrows indicated he

was not satisfied. He stated he had no knowledge of what the Peer Review Committee has done or what they have been consulted on. As well, he reiterated his earlier comments on the composition of the Peer Review Committee and suggested that Regional staff should not be a part of this committee.

Councillor Stewart asked staff when the “no lobbying” provision would begin. Ms. Schepers advised this would come into effect once the governing principles are approved by Council. The Councillor noted she took exception to lobbying being included in the same category as collusion.

Responding to questions from Councillor Stewart on the issue of termination without cause, Mr. Burrows stated that private sector operators could not make a competitive bid against the Region, building this risk into their bid. Mr. Sheflin suggested that a two bid process could be used (i.e. an “A” bid with the termination clause and a “B” bid without the termination clause). This would allow Council to make the decision as to whether it wished to have that extra flexibility or whether that extra flexibility is too expensive.

Councillor Stewart expressed her agreement with the delegation that there has not been sufficient time to review the report in detail and indicated she would be moving a motion to table the report

Committee Chair Hunter reminded the members the motion to defer would take precedence over the other motions put forward and the members comments should be limited to questions of the speaker.

Councillor Cullen, referring to the protocol employed with respect to lobbying for the Solid Waste contract, asked the speaker what benefit there would be to doing something different. Mr. Burrows replied that until the RFQ is completed, there should be unlimited consultation as is agreeable to staff, the industry and councillors. In this respect, the political aspect is avoided but the information is kept flowing. Mr. Burrows went on to say the WEPD operation is hugely more complicated than solid waste and there are many areas that require consultation (such as the principles contained in this report) between staff and the industry before matters are finalized.

Councillor Legendre asked Mr. Sanderson what his estimate of the cost of preparing a bid for this project would be. Mr. Sanderson, estimated it would cost between \$50,000 and \$500,000. He noted if the proponents were required to assume full maintenance risk, this would require them to dismantle equipment, do vibration and sensitivity analysis and also replace parts (bearings, gaskets, etc.) when the equipment is put back together; a baseline reference point would have to be established to enable the private sector operators to know what they are dealing with. Mr. Sheflin confirmed that access, in accordance with the risk that was expected, would be given to the bidders; he assured the Committee the facility would be kept running during this process.

Councillor Legendre stated he took exception to the “no lobbying” provision. Mr. Sheflin explained that staff’s concern is that information could be given to one

proponent and not to another; this provision is an attempt to ensure there is a level playing field and every party gets the same information from one contact person. As well, there is a concern that one of the bidders could have a proprietary approach; there is the potential to structure a tender so that only one contractor could bid. Mr. Sheflin noted this information was recently provided to another major player in the industry and they did not indicate a problem with the proposal. As well, there are others that were aware of the report and comfortable with the process who did not attend today's meeting and therefore believe it is going ahead. If changes are made that they are not aware of they could be unhappy with the changes.

In response to questions from Councillor Legendre regarding the timeline, Ms. Schepers advised the RFP will be prepared by the end of the year and it is staff's intent to start the RFQ in January 1997. Councillor Legendre felt this timeframe, provided potential for lobbying up until November.

Councillor Legendre asked if the possibility of one contractor winning the entire contract was possible and also if a contractor could bid on each business unit and then offer a reduced price to operate all of the facility. Commissioner Sheflin agreed that both were possible. He also noted that the business units offer the potential for smaller operators to be successful

Councillor Munter asked the delegation what primary element allowed the private sector to offer cost savings over the Region. Mr. Sanderson explained there are a number of factors such as more efficient use of labour, optimization that results in reduction of chemicals and energy and innovative techniques. Responding to questions from Councillor Munter concerning comments made by Commissioner Potter about the hiring of the highly specialized staff at the facility, Mr. Sanderson advised that 90% of the people that work for PSG are former municipal employees. He noted that PSG is familiar with the people working at the plant now and would be looking to offer them all employment, subject to whatever terms and conditions the Region establishes. Mr. Sheflin cautioned the Committee that in the negotiations for a contract the conditions may or may not require the contractor to hire the employees; he noted that any answer given now would be subject to whatever is in the RFP.

Councillor van den Ham asked the delegation if Governing Principle 7 (due diligence and monitoring) would add to the cost of the contract. Mr. Sanderson stated in the discussion papers, the cost was set as 5% to 10% of the contract cost, which he felt was extraordinarily high. He confirmed it is critical that the monitoring be done by the client.

Willy Bagnall, Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade , stated the Board of Trade supports the most efficient delivery of services to the taxpayer, regardless of whether it is RMOC staff or the private sector. Mr. Bagnall stipulated however, that a level playing field must be created and if the tender is won by the private sector, then the contractor must be treated as fairly as the Region proposes to treat its staff. The speaker felt a number of the principles presented do not create a level playing field but rather, they create an obvious bias. Referring to the single point of contact, Mr. Bagnall felt there

should be independent adjudication as the Region will be submitting a proposal as well, which could create monumental opportunity for conflict of interest. The second issue the speaker expressed concern with was the termination without cause proposal. He stated this is not a standard procedure in any level of contract. He said he spoke with one of the Peer Review Committee members who said that overwhelmingly a staff member overruled their recommendation of not including this clause.

Referring to the Peer Review Committee, Mr. Bagnall opined it is not a “Peer Review Committee” but rather a staff driven committee and he expressed support for the previous speaker’s remarks that Regional staff should not be participating in this committee. Further, he felt the members of the committee should have expertise in the relevant field.

In conclusion, Mr. Bagnall stated he found it reprehensible that a report of this magnitude would be released on a Friday for consideration the following Tuesday. He stated the public should be notified of these things and a public debate held it is however, difficult to get public and business input when only three days notice is given.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter concerning the issue of the single point of contact, Mr. Bagnall felt an independent consultant, that reports directly to Regional Council, should be used so there can be absolutely no question of any information transgressing within the department. Commissioner Sheflin felt it would be impossible to deal with this contract without staff involvement.

Councillor Cullen expressed agreement with Mr. Bagnall’s comments on the distribution of information and expressed the hope that something would be done about it. With regard to the points raised by Mr. Bagnall concerning the single point of contact and the termination without cause, Councillor Cullen noted these aspects applied to the solid waste contract as well and the Board of Trade did not have a problem with them at that time. Mr. Bagnall stated solid waste was a completely different set of circumstances.

Referring to comments made by the speaker regarding the Region’s point of contact, and the perceived conflict of interest, Councillor Legendre stated he could see no way around this. He suggested that even if a consultant were hired, it would be necessary for them to obtain answers to technical questions from RMOC staff. Mr. Bagnall responded that an outside consultant would create a distance and control the flow of information; that distance ultimately creates a “gap of honesty”. He felt it imperative that Regional staff and their proposal, be treated the same as the private sector.

Having heard from all public delegations, the Committee then turned their attention to the motion for deferral.

Councillor Stewart speaking to her motion, “That the Report and proposed amendments be tabled for two weeks for further consultation”, felt that by approving the report at this stage, the Committee would be handing off responsibility for

direction of the process; she stated she was not prepared to do this. The Region will be setting an example for the rest of Ontario in this process, not only in the savings garnered but also in how the Region treats its partners in the business community. The goal in the report is to make this process attractive to companies like PSG, and the Committee has heard they find certain of the proposed principles unacceptable. The Councillor felt this to be a critical stage and she asked the Committee to support her motion for deferral.

Responding to concerns raised by Commissioner Sheflin with regard to consultation, Committee Chair Hunter clarified he did not expect staff to seek out all those in the industry to ascertain if they were interested in providing input into the process but rather those that are interested should approach the Region. Ms. Schepers noted that at least four operators were aware of the report and the fact it was to be considered by Committee and Council. Although staff had not received comment from these companies, she suggested they should be contacted and advised of the deferral of this matter.

Councillor Legendre suggested that the report be deferred to the meeting of 25 June 96, as he will be absent from the 11 June 96 meeting to attend a conference. Councillor Stewart agreed to this amendment.

The following motions were tabled:

Moved by A. Munter

That Principle 6 be amended as follows:

“and that those currently employed by the WEPD, whether or not protected by collective agreement, will continue to be employed by the successful bidder”.

Moved by A. Munter

That the following be added as “Governing Principle #1”:

“1. That the public interest must be protected with respect to human health, occupational safety and environmental protection”; and

Further that the balance of the principles be renumbered accordingly.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That the wording in Governing Principle #14 be amended to read “and that an optimum number of three (3) respondents be retained for the Request for Proposal stage”.

Moved by A. Cullen

That the following be added:

The Region affirms that the public's \$1 billion dollar investment in wastewater collection and treatment infrastructure will remain in the public's hands. And that any private sector contract respect and recognize this important principle.

Moved by J. Legendre

"That contract performance be guaranteed by a combination of a letter of credit and a performance bond and that the performance bond be in a form which grants the RMOC authority to approve replacement contractors" be added as a Governing Principle.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Governing Principle #12 be amended by adding: "including additional monitoring responsibilities or internal efficiencies resulting from the contracting-out process" after the words "overall organization changes".

The Committee then approved the motion to table the report.

Moved by W. Stewart

That the report and proposed amendments be tabled to June 25th for further consultation.

CARRIED

4. WATER ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION DIVISION
BIOSOLIDS MANAGEMENT PLAN

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 10 May 96
- Annex A, Information Background Report issued separately
- Appendices A to G on file with the Regional Clerk
(Report tabled at 13 Feb 96 meeting of Planning and Environment Committee)

Councillor van den Ham asked staff if consideration had been given to utilizing the Trail Road Landfill site for the storage of biosolids, rather than spending \$65 million on a new storage facility. France Jacovella, Manager, Technical Support Branch, advised it is not staff's intent to proceed with the \$65 million storage facility in the short term. In the longer term, Trail Road Landfill site would be considered for off-site storage.

Councillor Stewart commended staff on the report, noting its ease of understanding. The Councillor then went on to speak to a letter she received from Peggy Land, a member of the Gloucester Environmental Advisory Committee (on file with the Regional Clerk). She reminded members Ms. Land had appeared before Committee at the 13 Feb 1996 meeting, when this report was tabled. Ms. Land is concerned the dioxins and furans in the sludge are going to be a hazard when applied to fields. She asked that staff comment on this.

Ms. Jacovella stated that biosolids land application is a practice that has been done internationally for over 40 years. In the Province of Ontario, over 75% of the municipalities land-apply their biosolids. The Ministry of Environment and Energy (MOEE) have established guidelines that govern land application of biosolids which were drafted in conjunction of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Health and Agriculture Canada. The guidelines include restrictions to ensure the public health and the environment are protected. The Region will always apply biosolids in accordance with the guidelines and the Certificates of Approval.

Councillor Stewart noted Ms. Land refers specifically to Regulation 347 of the Provincial Guidelines and asked if the Pickard Centre biosolids would be acceptable at the Laidlaw site under this regulation. Ms. Jacovella replied the biosolids from the Pickard Centre are authorized by the MOEE to be either landfilled or applied to agricultural land.

The Councillor advised that Ms. Land also feels the report does not give enough credence to the public's concerns about the pathogens and heavy metals; she feels it downplays such matters and concentrates on things such as the smell and the undesirability because of the nature of the matter. Ms. Jacovella stated the Biosolids Management Plan followed 15 months of public consultation. All of the comments received at open houses, presentations and workshops held in the various communities, are included in the report. She noted that smell was considered an issue by some people but for most people in the farming community, who are used to the smell of manure, they did not perceive a major difference.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Ms. Jacovella replied that farmers, who are now part of this program, would have used manure or chemical fertilizers before they started spreading biosolids. She noted some farmers would still have to supplement with chemical fertilizer, but likely to a lesser extent. The Ministry of Agriculture and Food identifies the requirements of chemical fertilizer needed in addition to the biosolids. As well, Ms. Jacovella noted that biosolids are a good soil conditioner, as they retain the moisture in the soil and tend to replace some of the top portion of the soil.

After hearing the response, Councillor Munter summarized that farmers are decreasing their costs through the use of biosolids and receiving significant value in terms of the long term impact. He felt this should lead to the logical conclusion that the Region should be compensated; in other words, the Region should sell this product.

Ms. Jacovella explained that competition for reusing biosolids has significantly reduced the cost of disposing of biosolids in Ottawa-Carleton. She noted a time when biosolids could only be used for landfill cover at Laidlaw landfill site, Laidlaw controlled the market and could charge the Region whatever they wanted. By having the option of land application, they now have to compete to receive the biosolids (it has a beneficial purpose for both parties), so the Region's cost has been reduced. She went on to explain that farmers have to adjust their crop scheduling to take into consideration the availability of biosolids. Staff are concerned that imposing a cost for biosolids will reduce the farmers' interest because, if there is not a significant material advantage to them, they may no longer be interested in biosolids. By losing their interest, the Region would also lose its competitive advantage of having more than one option.

Councillor Munter noted the demand for biosolids has been greater than the Region has been able to accommodate. He concluded that when demand outstrips supply, this is an indication that you have a commodity that is worth something. Ms. Jacovella stated that staff are unsure at this time whether demand would continue to outstrip supply if there was a cost. She noted as well, there are very few municipalities internationally that charge for biosolids. Staff feel there is not currently a large enough base of farmers to test this theory; however, if market conditions should change staff would review this aspect.

Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department added that the Region of Halton has been very aggressive and innovative in this area and they believe they are getting close to the point where they will consider charging but are not there yet. Mr. Sheflin predicted the RMOC is a few years away from charging yet. He reiterated comments made by Ms. Jacovella that because of the competition generated by land application, the Region's costs are going down. If the Region imposed a charge, and no one was buying, the Region would be in a difficult position.

Councillor Cullen, referring to leachate from Trail Road which is put into the system for treatment and ends up in the biosolids, sought assurance from staff that the contaminants contained in the leachate would be monitored. Nancy Schepers,

Director, Water Environment Protection Division replied that prior to accepting the leachate at the plant, staff do a full characterization of the leachate and then monitor the condition of the biosolids to see what kind of impact the leachates have.

In response to questions from Councillor Legendre, Ms. Jacovella confirmed the MOEE's Certificate of Approval does not allow storage of biosolids at one location, if they are to be used at another agricultural site. The MOEE has many procedures that must be followed when applying biosolids on agricultural land, such as soil testing, delineation and maps, so they know exactly what is done. If the Region wanted to store biosolids at the Pickard Centre and then spread it on various fields, staff would have to apply to the MOEE for an amendment to the Certificate of Approval.

Councillor Legendre noted the report stated "farmers objected to biosolids application being canceled due to one opposing opinion". He asked if this had actually happened. Ms. Jacovella confirmed that it had. The Councillor went on to express his frustration that the process has moved so slow. Ms. Jacovella noted that most municipalities who have undergone the initiation of the land application program, have found that the initial reaction is very negative; yet a few years later, the reaction is more positive. This has led to the theory that "If you go at it slowly and build public interest and public support, you will win in the long term." This is what the Region has attempted to do, by conveying to the public a better understanding of what biosolids are and their benefits. The Region is now in a position to say "we are in our fourth year of applying biosolids" and the public is more accepting because of this experience.

Councillor Legendre felt the issue of contaminants had been well addressed in the report. He noted the contaminants appear in very small quantities (well within the norm) however, there is nothing in the tables to indicate how these elements appear in a "background sense" (i.e. elements that accumulate through the process). Ms. Jacovella responded the biosolids meet all of the acceptable levels established by the MOEE. She noted some of the contaminants will be converted during the process, some will evaporate during aeration and others will be tied to the solids portion of the wastewater and therefore, may end up in the biosolids. She confirmed that many of these pathogens are naturally occurring and would be found in the environment in any case. Councillor Legendre cautioned that with modern scientific equipment, it is possible to detect almost anything and particular attention should be paid to the concentrations.

With regard to the issue of charging for biosolids, Councillor Legendre commented he felt the report was rather ambivalent on this point. Mr. Sheflin reiterated the points he had made earlier concerning the timing of instituting a charge and establishing a solid market for the product.

Councillor Beamish asked if it was staff's intent to apply as much biosolids as possible during the dates specified in the report (i.e. April 15 to October 31), once a method for storage has been established. Ms. Jacovella responded that the intent is to maximize the amount of biosolids that can be land applied by having on-site or off-site storage

facilities at minimal cost and where feasible (weather permitting), go beyond the dates specified.

Committee Chair Hunter, referring to a letter received from Mr. Phil Kerrigan of Waste Conversion Inc. (WCI), indicated Mr. Kerrigan has an alternative proposal which he feels would be less costly to the taxpayer and is therefore taking issue with Recommendation 3, which is “develop a plan to establish on-site or off-site storage to facilitate the use of more biosolid production on agricultural land”. Mr. Kerrigan’s letter is on file with the Regional Clerk. Chair Hunter noted that Mr. Joe Kennedy of WCI was present to speak on behalf of Mr. Kerrigan.

Joe Kennedy, Waste Conversion Inc. (WCI), explained that WCI is an Ottawa-based engineering firm that focuses on converting selected waste streams into value added products. For the past two years WCI has been developing a central composting facility to serve the IC&I sector of the Region of Ottawa-Carleton. This facility, located on 15 acres of land in the industrial park on Rideau Road, just off of Hwy. 31, will employ state of the art enclosed containerized composting technology. WCI has received its Certificate of Approval from the MOEE and hope to have the facility in operation by the fall.

Mr. Kennedy stated WCI believes it can provide a composting service for the biosolids that is more cost effective, environmentally safe and sustainable than land spreading. By stabilizing the biosolids through the composting process, the end result is a much higher value-added and beneficial product and WCI feels it can do this at a much lower cost. The speaker noted this information had been given to WEPD staff but he did not feel the recommendations made to the Committee leave the door open for such a service. In particular, Recommendation 3 poses the most concern; the speaker felt once these storage facilities are put in place, it will be an almost irreversible direction and will be difficult to consider other options such as composting.

Referring to the 30 Jan 1996 report on the Biosolids Management Plan, Mr. Kennedy noted staff estimate it would cost \$5 million to construct the storage facility and the operating and maintenance costs would be \$83 per dry tonne. This equates to at least \$170 per wet tonne of sludge for the owning and operating costs. WCI’s cost would be approximately 50% of this and would require no borrowing of money by the Region. WCI intends to develop markets for this compost and once this product is accepted, it is anticipated WCI will be receiving a good revenue.

Mr. Kennedy urged the Committee to recognize the private sector’s capability and potential role to increase the use of biosolids through composting and to direct staff look at private sector composting before proceeding any further. He felt it would be best for the Region to have a more diversified biosolids program rather than committing exclusively to land spreading with its inherent long term uncertainties. Mr. Kennedy felt a program to handle 25% of the biosolids through the composting program should be considered

Committee Chair Hunter, noted Mr. Kerrigan of WCI had sent letters to staff on April 12 and 26 commenting on the biosolids plan, yet his suggestions do not seem to be reflected in the report. The Chair asked for staff comment on this. Ms. Schepers replied that Recommendation 5 deals with the other alternatives. She noted in the short term, there is no plan to use a lot of capital dollars to construct storage facilities. As well, staff will be flexible and respond to changes in market conditions and legislation that would enable a different, more effective method of dealing with the biosolids. Ms. Schepers went on to say that WCI's proposal could be considered as part of the multi-year proposals on land application to optimize resource recovery.

Chair Hunter pointed out that Mr. Kennedy had stated WCI is prepared to help create the demand for the biosolid product now. Mr. Kennedy confirmed this and noted in their long term plan, they would be looking at utilizing 25% of the biosolids coming out of the Region. The facility will be up and running in the fall; it is their intention to do trials on the biosolids in cooperation with the WEPD people and then get into production.

The Chair felt the wording "review and monitor", insofar as having composting as an alternative, appeared too weak a recommendation. Ms. Schepers stated the goal is to ensure competition, to be flexible and to make the best use of all of the options available and not be committed to one way of dealing with biosolids. Ms. Jacovella pointed out that Recommendation 2 speaks to starting a multi-year contract for use of biosolids as soil conditioner; in the next few months staff will be going out with requests for proposals for biosolids use and WCI is welcome to submit a proposal at that time. If their proposal is cost effective, they have a good chance of being successful. Referring to the numbers provided by Mr. Kennedy (i.e. 50% of \$170 per dry tonne), Ms. Jacovella advised the present cost to the Region is \$60 per dry tonne.

Councillor Munter commented that because WCI will be treating biosolids as a commodity, the Region should be selling it to them. Mr. Kennedy replied that market conditions prevail; WCI will be offering a reduced cost than what it presently costs the Region however, they are business people and must price the market. Commissioner Sheflin noted the Region will put it out to the competition; if the market is willing to pay the Region this is the option that will be selected, otherwise the best economical solution will be chosen. Ms. Schepers suggested the Request for Proposal (RFP) could be structured in such a way as to enable the private sector partner to charge a fee and then the proposals could be considered in this respect.

Responding to questions from Councillor Stewart with regard to Recommendation 3, Ms. Schepers advised the plans to develop storage facilities would appear in the Official Plan but would not be in the five year budget. Councillor Stewart expressed concern that, having recognized these facilities in the Official Plan, it would be difficult to convince private sector interests the Region is really looking at alternatives in an up front fashion.

Chair Hunter asked Mr. Kennedy if, given the comments regarding Recommendations 2 and 5, his concerns were addressed. Mr. Kennedy replied that it appears the Region

is going ahead 100% towards land spreading application; the fact the Region will “review and monitor” other uses does not provide much comfort. Mr. Sheflin noted the Region is not committing to a particular amount of land spreading or other uses; staff will be recommending to Council the system which meets all of the criteria and is the least cost (or revenue producing).

At this juncture, the Chair Hunter read the following motions for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That a recommendation 2(a) be added: ”Recognize the private sector’s capability and potential role to increase the beneficial use of biosolids”.

CARRIED

Moved by A. Munter

Work towards the ultimate goal of selling this product as a commodity.

CARRIED

Councillor Hill expressed concern about Recommendation 3. Mr. Sheflin noted that staff presently only require approval to include this in the official plan; he suggested the recommendation be reworded.

Chair Hunter stated he would be reluctant to approve this Recommendation until he knew what the cost would be to include it in the Official Plan. Ms. Schepers stated there are two components to this issue; one is the Official Plan which recognizes there may have to be capital expenditures in the future and the other is identifying smaller scale sites that could store biosolids on a short term basis for land application. She felt that Recommendation 3 deals more with the latter. Commissioner Sheflin suggested that Recommendation 3 be deferred and staff would come back with a better idea.

Moved by B. Hill

That Recommendation 3, “Develop a plan to establish on-site or off-site storage to facilitate the use of more biosolids production on agricultural land” be referred back to staff;

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations as amended by the foregoing.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council endorse the recommendations of the Biosolids Management Plan, May 1996 and, specifically, that the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, (RMOC):

1. **Optimize resource recovery and the cost of biosolids management by applying dewatered biosolids on agricultural land from April 15 to October 31 and as landfill cover for the remainder of the year;**
2. **Establish a multi year contract starting in 1997 for use of biosolids as a soil conditioner;**
- 2(a). Recognize the private sector's capability and potential role to increase the beneficial use of biosolids;**
- 3. That Recommendation 3, "Develop a plan to establish on-site or off-site storage to facilitate the use of more biosolids production on agricultural land" be referred back to staff;**
4. **Continue to supply biosolids at no fee to the farming community;**
5. **Continue to review and monitor other beneficial reuse alternatives such as composting and thermal drying as biosolids management alternatives, and continue to monitor technical development and change in cost efficiencies;**
6. **Investigate the feasibility of developing a soil testing project at one biosolids application site to monitor the soil characteristics following land application of biosolids;**
- 7. Work towards the ultimate goal of selling this product as a commodity.**

CARRIED

5. **INDUSTRIAL WASTE - SEWER USE REGULATION
PART 5.2 REGIONAL REGULATORY CODE**

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 26 Apr 96

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council approve that the Regional Regulatory Code be amended to provide that all sewers and sewage works owned or operated by or on behalf of any person and all connections thereto which mediately or immediately enter into such works within the Regional area are regulated by the provisions of Part 5.2, Sewers, Sewage Works and Control of Discharges.

CARRIED

6. **BY-LAW FOR THE COLLECTION, REMOVAL
AND DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE**

- Director, Solid Waste Div., Env. and Transp. Dept. report dated 09 May 96

- Solid Waste Collection By-law on file with the Regional Clerk

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

- 1. The enactment of a new by-law providing for the collection, removal and disposal of solid waste, and the collection and diversion of recyclable material and leaf and yard waste in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton;**
- 2. Rescind By-law No. 22 of 1995.**

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

Committee Chair Hunter advised the Committee that there would be a joint Planning and Environment and Transportation Committee meeting on September 23 and 24 to consider the Regional Development Strategy report. The meetings will begin at 9:00 a.m. on both days. The first day, public delegations will be heard and the second day, Committee deliberation will take place.

With regard to the summer meeting schedule, Chair Hunter advised that the July meeting will take place on 9 July. It is anticipated that an August meeting will not be necessary and will therefore be canceled.

INQUIRIES

Councillor Cullen, referring to the Housing Series on Background Papers, requested that the Committee be briefed at a future meeting, on the two papers dealing with Affordable Housing and Rental Housing.

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

OMB Hearing: RMOC vs. Hughes

- Acting Regional Solicitor's memorandum dated 10 May 96

Solid Waste 3rs Strategic Planning

- Dir., Solid Waste Div., Env. and Transp. Dept. memorandum dated 06 May 96

The Housing Series of Background Papers

- Planning and Property Commissioner's memorandum dated 09 May 96

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR