

**BUREAU D'AUDIENCES PUBLIQUES
SUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT**

PRESENT: Ms. CLAUDETTE JOURNAULT, Chair
Mr. DONALD LABRIE, Commissioner

**PUBLIC HEARING
PROJECT TO ESTABLISH A
TECHNICAL LANDFILL SITE AT DANFORD LAKE
IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF ALLEYN-et-CAWOOD**

SECOND PHASE

VOLUME 4

Hearing held June 14, 2007, 19 h
Salle récréative d'Otter Lake
394 rue Tessier
Otter Lake

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BRIEFS PRESENTATION :

MUNICIPALITÉ D'OTTER LAKE	
KERRY RICHARD.....	4
MRC DE PONTIAC	
ANDRÉ CORDEAU, PIERRE DUCHESNE.....	8
MUNICIPALITÉ DE MANSFIELD-de-PONTEFRACT	
RICHARD ROMAIN.....	18
KEN MOLYNEAUX, LORRAINE MOLYNEAUX.....	21
YES COMMITTEE	
PRISCILLA KUBLEK LATIMER.....	26
ODETTE CHÂTEAUVERT-JOLY.....	32
LINDA CRONK.....	37
PATRICK FOWLER.....	39
MUNICIPALITÉ DE BRYSON	
ALBERT DAVIES.....	45
GILLES PELLETIER.....	51
RIGHT OF CORRECTION	
RAYE THOMAS.....	55
CHARLENE SCHARF.....	56
ANDRÉ POULIN.....	56
OTA HORA.....	58
RENATO LIVINAL.....	59

MS. CLAUDETTE JOURNAULT,
THE CHAIRWOMAN:

5

(Translation) Well, now would you please sit down. If everyone would please sit down.

10

Ladies and gentlemen, good evening, and welcome to the second part of the public hearings concerning the project to establish a technical landfill site in Danford Lake in the Alleyn and Cawood municipality. And I am the Chair of this hearing and I carry out the mandate given to me by the Minister Lyne Beauchamp who is responsible for sustainable development. I have with me Mr. Donald Labrie who is a Commissioner.

15

Allow me now to introduce the team that is part of The Commission. The analysts who support the work of the Commission are Mr. Jean Roberge and Jasmin Bergeron. Also, there is Monique Lajoie who is part of our team, but she's not here tonight.

20

And the Co-ordinator of the Secretariat of the Commission is Madame Renée Poliquin. And the responsible for relations with media and citizens is Mr. Jean-Sébastien Filion.

The Commission is also assisted by a team from the Shared Services Centre of Quebec made up of Mr. Michel Pilteau who is responsible for the technical organization and logistics of these public hearings, and Mr. Martin Lajoie who is responsible for the sound.

25

And all of the comments of the second part of the public hearings will be re-transcribed by Madame Lise Maisonneuve and Annagret Rinaldi who are the official stenographers. And the simultaneous translation service is also given by Services de Traduction du Nord.

30

And we have already had a first part of these public hearings on the fifteen (15th), sixteenth (16th) and seventeenth (17th) of May last, the first part of the public hearings, who had as its objective to get a proper understanding of the project and its impacts.

35

And now we are at the second part where the time has come to hear the opinions of all. So I would ask for silence from the back of the hall, please. We have difficulty hearing, so please could we have silence at the back of the hall.

40

Now, this is how we will be holding these hearings. We will ask persons who have registered to present a... who wish to present a brief or a verbal presentation, first of all to come forward and they will be... they are given twenty-five (25) minutes for each presentation, which includes the period of discussion with the members of The Commission. You are free to use this period as you wish, but it is quite certain that we prefer to have a little bit of time to discuss with you and to understand your point of view properly and to understand what you

have said during your presentation and the presentation of your brief.

45 And so, if time permits, we will also receive other persons who may register, but generally the time is very limited, so give your name to the co-ordinator who is at the back of the hall for registration, and we'll do what we can, if you have not yet reserved time to make a presentation before The Commission.

50 And during this... for this second part of the public hearings, there are resource persons from the departments, from the municipalities, et cetera. They do not have a particular role to play but, of course, they are very welcome to take part in these public hearings. And to become aware of what the citizens think.

55 And tonight's hearing is one (1) of the eight (8) hearings that we are going to hold. This is the fourth (4th) of eight (8). There will be one (1) tomorrow afternoon beginning at one o'clock (1:00) until seven o'clock (7:00)... until five o'clock (5:00), and then from seven (7) until eleven (11). That will be tomorrow, Friday.

60 And Saturday morning we start up at nine o'clock (9:00) until noon, and then most probably there will be a hearing in the afternoon, unless there are last minute adjustments that have to be made.

65 So we would like to remind you that it is very important to remain calm and in an orderly manner, as we did in the first hearings. So I remind you that any disrespect... no disrespectful or defamatory comment will be accepted. And no... we will not allow anyone to express approval or disapproval in the hall.

70 And just like the resource persons, you have the right to rectify or to correct certain facts. So, if in the course of the hearing you hear something that is a fact, not an opinion but a fact that is imprecise or that is untrue, then I would ask you to register and at the end of the hearing there will be a time when you can come forward and correct that incorrect fact. And you can do this until next Wednesday, as well, once you have had a chance to see the briefs that have been tabled, the briefs are made public and accessible to all when they are tabled.

75 Up to this evening, no one else has, except the members of The Commission and the team have seen these briefs, up until tonight. So when you are going to use this right to correct facts, you must be quite brief and simply correct any incorrect fact that has been brought up.

80 Concerning the briefs, we return them... we receive them right up till the final hearing, but if you have... there are documents that were received quite late last Friday of this week even, so these people who have already tabled a brief, you can complete them, if you wish, to add certain new facts that have come to light.

85

And we would underline that The Commission is continuing its inquiry and we will table this with the consultation centres in the region and on the BAPE's internet site. And all of these documents will be made available and everything that we have used to make our inquiry will be on the internet site and that is specially... the part of the site that is specially for The

90

Commission.

95

And then in this second part of the public hearings we are going to table a report because we have done an analysis of everything that was said, of all the... and so we are going to make a report and advice to the Minister of Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks who will then use the report of The Commission and will also use the report from the Department of Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks in order to... both of which will be presented to the Minister and then the Minister will come to make a decision with the cabinet.

100

So I repeat, The Commission is not a decision making body. It is simply that we report to the Minister and the cabinet makes the decision. Our report becomes the report of the BAPE and will be tabled with the Minister by the fifteenth (15th) of September. She then has sixty (60) days to publish it. All of the BAPE reports are public and you can consult them on the BAPE web site.

105

So on that site... that site is continually updated, and you will be able to follow the work of The Commission and the various reports on that site. So in the weeks to come, all new information received by The Commission will be made public and will be made accessible on this site.

110

And finally, we would underline that the BAPE has given itself a declaration of service to the citizens, and that the organization gives you a questionnaire in order to evaluate the services that we have given you in order to help us better to serve you. So we would ask you to please fill out this questionnaire which is available for this near the entrance to the hall and to submit it before you leave. So you will see the evaluation sheet available at the back of the hall.

115

120

So to begin we have the Municipality of Otter Lake. And if the Municipality of Otter Lake would like to make a declaration, they are quite welcome. I know that you have tabled a brief, you are welcome. Please be seated. Please identify yourselves for the purposes of the transcription because everything that is said is recorded and you will have transcripts in English and French.

125

So as for those among you who want to have the... take advantage of the simultaneous interpretation, you can get hearing devices, listening devices at the back of the hall.

MR. KERRY RICHARD:

130 (Translation) So I welcome everyone to Otter Lake. I am Kerry Richard the Mayor of Otter Lake. My French is not all that wonderful, so I'll be doing my presentation in English.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

135 (Translation) That's fine, sir.

MR. KERRY RICHARD:

140 I have to say that when discussions came about at the Regional County Council about a regional landfill site and the possibility of it being in Danford Lake, only fifteen (15) kilometres away from my municipality, I thought that this was going to be the answer to our waste problems without an outrageous pricetag to the taxpayers.

145 One thing, however, that always stuck in the back of my mind was the fact that we were all being told to shut down our landfill sites due to hazardous materials being deposited in them.

150 What I do have trouble understanding is that we are a population of eight hundred (800) people, and now we're being... going to put all of our garbage with seventeen (17) other municipalities, plus all the Outaouais, plus whoever else becomes a client of the engineered landfill site. And yet, another hole in the ground exactly what we are doing now, the difference being this liner that we are all concerned about.

155 With the recent information that I have received on plasma gasification, I no longer feel that the engineered landfill site is the answer to our problem nor is it the safest way to go.

160 When you sit back and weigh the pros and the cons to projects like this, the pros of plasma gasification outweigh those of the landfill site. And for me, the biggest plus is the fact that the waste is going... the waste is gone and being used to create energy rather than sitting in a hole in the ground with the possibility of yet... of creating yet another cancer causing chemical.

One article in particular in the Plasco Energy Group portfolio that caught my eye was under the title "Environmental Impact", and I would like to read that part to you, and it states:

165 *"It is important to note that hazardous substances in the waste delivered to Plasco Energy are removed and sent for control disposal where they should have been sent to to begin with instead of being sent to a landfill site. This is a very important and crucial issue to*

170 *make people aware of. In a landfill site everything and anything can go in there if the people don't take the time to sort their waste properly."*

175 Even our own little municipality here in the last two (2) years have set up oil containers for waste oil. Companies come to pick up our paint cans, our steel, our tires, et cetera. And we started off recycling with two (2) bins picked up every two (2) weeks. And now we have ten (10) bins picked up every week... which are emptied every week.

180 Which leads me to one last comment I wish to make before I finish, and that is, if please everyone, if we would all take the time to recycle properly and use the services that are available to get rid of our oils, our paints, our batteries, et cetera, and learn how to compost, there would not be a whole lot of waste left to manage. Thank you very much.

185 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Mayor, Mr. Mayor, excuse me, we have a few questions to ask you. Please don't leave.

190 So we heard in the course of the last two (2) days... do you understand what I'm saying in French? Do you understand me in French? Okay, we're bringing you a translation device, sir. Someone's bringing you one. Can you hear me, sir?

195 Okay, in the course of the last two (2) days people from other RCMs, from other municipalities, mayors and reeves have come before us to say that it's important to have a regional togetherness in order to get a long-term solution.

200 How do you see an approach in which people would... from the RCMs and from the City of Gatineau could develop together in collaboration a long-term solution, because some have said that the proposal that is presently being studied is really more a proposal to answer a short-term problem, so how do you see them working together in the long-term for a long-term solution?

205 MR. KERRY RICHARD:

Well, first of all, I think that the people have to get together to come up with an idea to eliminate garbage for good. I don't think that a short-term solution is the answer. I think the idea of working with the whole Outaouais, I have no problem with working with the whole Outaouais, with the Pontiac, as long as it's done in a manner that the waste is dealt with properly.

My biggest problem, as I stated in my speech, was the fact that I prefer to see the waste being... disappearing completely rather than being left in the ground and creating more

210 chemicals. And this is what I think would have to happen. And it's not a matter of doing it just
our municipality or three (3) municipalities or five (5) municipalities, it should be done all
around. And like I said earlier, if the people have to get together and learn to educate the kids
and learn to do the recycling properly. Thank you.

215 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) In the policy of waste management... in Quebec's policy on waste
management, the objective is to reduce by sixty percent (60%) waste, waste by sixty percent
(60%), generally speaking. Everything that is recyclable or reusable would be used or
220 recycled. And among these substances there is the... there is, for example, what can be
decomposed, composted, such as leaves and such. And these are the things that cause
leachate, which is basically called garbage juice, commonly, and also which causes bad
odours such as biogas and when it is put in landfill sites. But the policy requires that sixty
percent (60%) of these matter be withdrawn from the garbage.

225 So is it possible that in areas where people are spread out such as here, is it
economically possible or financially possible to do a three-way collection? That is to say, to
separate compostable matter in order to eliminate it from the landfill site? How do you... do
you see that as possible, or how do you see... what is your view on that?

230 MR. KERRY RICHARD:

Well, I think if we can... if we can eliminate it, certainly it would help the landfill sites. I
think the less we... that we put into the landfill sites the better, that's why it should be compost
235 separate from, like the... I stated earlier, the recycling, the composting, everything works
together. If we throw... if we just deposit everything in one (1) landfill site, I don't think it's going
to work out because it should be done separately, for me.

240 MR. DONALD LABRIE,
THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Mr. Mayor, you have referred to a method of... a thermal method of waste
elimination which is a plasma treatment. Do you have any other alternative technologies that
you have heard about that are alternatives to landfill, to technical landfill sites?

245 MR. KERRY RICHARD:

No, actually, the only one was the... is the Plasco, which I just spoke of, which to me
made a lot of sense after reading the portfolio from Plasco. The amount of jobs created and
250 the... and the way the whole project was approached. Weighing the pros and the cons of both

projects, to me it was the way to go with... the safest way. Not necessarily, maybe not the most economic way, but it doesn't always boil down to the dollars.

255 Yes, we, as elected officials, we are responsible to manage the tax dollars properly, but we are also responsible for the public's health and well being also.

THE COMMISSIONER:

260 (Translation) But we have spoken to you of a technology that is perhaps the most expensive and the most efficient, but there are perhaps other technologies such as incineration or triple collection that have been experimented with in Canada.

265 And so, we wanted to explain that there are other technologies as well as plasma treatment that exist and that are also efficient. And that composting can in one process be collected so that organic matter is collected and composted. And in this way there will ultimately be some garbage, some trash that will... that must be eliminated in the technical landfill site all the same, but...

MR. KERRY RICHARD:

270 I'm not saying that I am not... I am not open to hear any other options to eliminating our waste. I am just speaking on the Plasco simply because I am more... I have more... reserve more information on it. But yes, definitely, I would be open to hear other... other projects.

275 THE COMMISSIONER:

280 (Translation) Well, now, this elimination centre, whatever technology is used that would be an alternative to a technical landfill site, this would answer... do you think that this elimination centre should be to answer... when they talked about plasma technology, did they say that it could be here in the RCM only to treat the RCM's waste or did they say that there might be a regional approach in the use of plasma technology?

MR. KERRY RICHARD:

285 No, from what I read in the portfolio it's definitely not for only the regional county of Pontiac, it's for all of the Outaouais. From what I can understand, it could be set up to service the whole Outaouais.

THE COMMISSIONER:

290 (Translation) I have no further questions. Thank you, Mr. Mayor

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

295 (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for your testimony. So now we invite the Pontiac RCM to testify. Good day.

MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

300 (Translation) So, Madame Commissioner and Mr. Labrie, I am André Cordeau. I am the Director General of the Pontiac RCM and Secretary/Treasurer as well. And I will not read extensively from our brief, which has been tabled with you last week, and which you have had probably a chance to read.

305 But I will, first of all, would like to thank you on behalf of the Pontiac RCM. To thank the BAPE for having given us a chance to be able to give our opinion on the establishment of a technical landfill site at Danford Lake in the Alleyn and Cawood municipality. This project is situated on our RCM land.

310 And I am... I have with me here Mr. Pierre Duchesne who is responsible for waste management. And I thank him for his efforts and for the time he has given in enlightening The Commission and the population as a whole. And I am also accompanied here by MR. Michael McCrank who is our reeve and the acting reeve MR. Brian Adam. And who... there are other mayors as well such as MR. Bouchard and others who are present here in the hall tonight.

315 And in our brief we have given a brief picture of our RCM and its plan for waste management that has been in place since the tenth (10th) of October, two thousand and six (2006). So we will not go into detail about what our RCM is all about, because what we would like to really deal with is whether or not the Pontiac RCM backs this project, and what our
320 concerns are.

325 So, first of all, I will say right off that the present brief concludes with the support that is given to the project for this technical landfill site, even though we have certain economic and social concerns.

I will talk about the regionalization, and you've also asked questions on Otter Lake in that respect.

330 To start with, the quantity of residual matters to eliminate, if we're talking about six thousand (6,000) cubic tons does not allow the RCM of Pontiac to support this on its own. It is really important and we must mention it more than once, that as of two thousand nine (2009) no site will be allowed on the Quebec territory. All LETs will not be tolerated unless they are complying with the regulation and they will become LETs.

335 So all the RCM of the Outaouais have found themselves in a critical situation as a
result. We are in front of a situation of a fait accompli with which we have to deal with. And our
legal obligation and it's not possible for us to extrapolate or to imagine scenarios, imagine that
this scenario will not happen at the end of two thousand eight (2008) and at the beginning of
two thousand nine (2009). We have the obligation as RCM and citizens with respect to the
340 law, and it puts us in a situation where we have to react according to the legal obligations that
the government is confronting us with.

 In two thousand six (2006) the table of the reeve of the Outaouais created an ad hoc
committee to find a sustainable solution supporting a partnership between cities and including
345 Gatineau.

 To start with to make a LET viable and to include all the... to deal with all these residual
matters, we had to deal with an enormous amount of the residual matters.

350 So from ten (10) to fifteen thousand (15,000) cubic tons would be sufficient to make it
profitable. So the RCM of Pontiac cannot support it on its own since it doesn't generate
enough of a volume and doesn't have the financial means to be able to do it. Of course, the
participation of the Gatineau city would allow us to have a LET and to choose the proper
technology.

355 In my personal name, and I'm not talking in the name of the RCM when I say this on
the side, if during the months the implication or the involvement of Gatineau was on a minimal
basis, it's only during the last few weeks that there was some opening that allowed us to think
that we could work on some long-term solution for all of the Outaouais region.

360 But I come back to my comment of the beginning, we are in front of a situation that is a
fait accompli where our trenches will have to be closed and we have a legal and moral
obligation as administration, as elected members of Pontiac to find a solution in order to
respect the law. And that was a short-term solution in that situation of short-term is imposed to
365 us by the rules that will make it so, that all these trench sites will have to be closed by the end
of the year of two thousand eight (2008).

 And according to the choices, RCM accepted not to transport its garbage outside of the
territory. It is based on an economic argument. The cost of transportation is a very important
370 factor, as we said in our brief, it's more than important, it's a fundamental principle in order to
manage residual matter.

 The distances to travel to bring all this garbage to certain sites, like Lachute, for
example, and according to the information that we've received in the last few weeks, when this
375 brief was written, are higher than the site that is proposed, and will create a lot more cost. So

for more than a hundred (100) kilometres or more, this creates also additional environmental problems. And for us it's too far and too costly. And in front of this, the choice of the site in the RCM of Pontiac for a regional treatment site became necessary.

380 I will also say on the side, we have to realize that we are in a resource region, a region which on an economic level has met with a lot of difficulties in the last few months. You are not without knowing in the forestry throughout Quebec included Pontiac, most of the manufacturing that was related to the forest industry, we have been hit very hard.

385 And as you know, in the agricultural sector, Pontiac is recognized for the beef. So again, mad cow disease was also hitting us full frontward. And so the money is not... the monies aren't always in front of us, and so we will take a few years to settle all these problems.

390 You will understand that for the mayors the costs related to residual management is important. I would say that in Pontiac we have economic difficulties and we are very sensitive to this, and concerning the distances that we would have to transport these residual matter.

395 We would ask you to look on page 8 in the chart, look at the distances. And when we are talking about Rapides-des-Joachims, the distance which at the extreme portion of our territory is already one hundred and eighty-two (182) kilometres. And if we're going to look at Lachute, we would be at three hundred and forty-nine (349) kilometres. So it's very significant. And so we don't need to be a mathematician to understand the additional costs that would be generated.

400 LDC, the promoter looked for a site in Outaouais in order to identify one that would meet with the criteria that met with their impact study, and so they chose this site in RCM. So Allevyn and Cawood, which is on Route 301 in Gatineau is one hundred and eighty (180) kilometres from the site answer these criteria.

405 These municipalities accepted to receive a LET on its territory. On the other side, the MRC of Pontiac looked at other places. And following the analysis, we came to the conclusion that the proposed site by LDC was one that would have the least impact and that could be okay in the co-existence of all the people around it. So we would only have one (1) LET in this territory.

410 So RCM of Pontiac knew that the establishment of a LET would certainly meet with resistance of the residents whatever area we will choose. In fact no one really wants such a site near their homes.

415 In terms of the technology, you are not without knowing, and for the benefits of those who do not know, a site is just filled. Residual matter is covered continuously every day to

avoid the nuisances from mainly the seagulls. So it creates biogas in the atmosphere and also creates leachate.

420 So we wondered if there were other technologies that would be more beneficial or more
environmental but remained reasonable. And the reeves looked at the solution. After many
meetings, they compared the technology, like the technical burial site or in the tri-methanisation
and tri-composting. And the technical site presented more advantages. But in an economical
425 aspect, it cost the less. However, it is just a site where we send all the waste and there's no
added value.

As to the other technology, they all have some inconveniences that are not negligible.
So a new technology, for example, for Quebec that is not recognized by the environment
department of Quebec, and on top, it might not be viable regarding the cost of the electricity.
430 And this appreciation was according to the appreciation we made of it in the last few weeks.

The tri-methanisation or gasification and the tri-composting, and for the benefits of all
the members, we have added an appendix with scenarios for the management of a site. And it
was presented on the twelfth (12th) of March.

435 As for the public management or public sector management, we are told that the RCM
cannot support on its own a LET. The financial risks and technical and economical are too big.
And if we're going to participate or share these costs, of course, the conflicts are unavoidable.

440 The PPs are interested, but it's a new domain or new field, and we know it very well,
and we have to look at all the legal aspects. And with the municipal laws, it doesn't always go
very well, because we are in a file and with our lawyers we are really wondering what is the
right solution, because it's two (2) different cultures and two (2) ways of managing these things.
In a legal way we have two (2) different applications.

445 We have to look at the weight of managing such risks and the sharing of the risks
during the operation and after the closing of the site is really difficult to accept by the citizens,
and so we don't have... in the public sector it's not the same as in the public domain. And it's
accompanied with the sufficient guarantee for the cost according to the interpretation of the
450 environment, the security and safety of the citizens.

The fact that we are in favour, I submit, that does not mean that we are going to limit
our surveillance or supervision and our vigilance according to the points that I have just
mentioned.

455 In concluding, the RCM of Pontiac is in favour of the establishment of a LET in Danford
Lake in the municipality of Alleyn and Cawood. Until June nineteen (19), two thousand nine

460 (2009) we have to be in compliance with the new rules and the trenches will have to be closed. And the LES, which is a sanitary dumping site will also have to be closed and it will not be transformed into a technical site. And so it places us in front of a critical situation, if we want to ensure a fair management of these residual matter.

465 So we have to find a solution to this problem as to the establishment of a site in Alleyn and Cawood. It could be a short-term solution. The RCM of Pontiac is looking at other technologies also; plasma gasification, tri-composting. And even though they have advantages in terms of the environment, some of them may not be recognized and they are still too costly to implement here.

470 I will mention again, that on an economical level we are the ninety-fourth (94th) MRCs or CM and we have a lot of challenges to meet. And we do not have the means to do this. So there is no other short-term project that could be done. There are no other solutions that could solve our problem to eliminate this residual matter, when all these trench dumping sites will have to be closed. And so the RCM cannot support it alone.

475 And the mayors of Pontiac have decided that in the policy of Quebec to manage these residual matter could not export these residual matters, but to identify a site, and this is why it decided to look at this possibility of having a LET on its territory.

480 So we will be vigilant regarding the environment and the underground waters and all the economical and social aspects as well. The RCM of Pontiac is looking for a commitment on the part of the proponent and the control of the number of tons that will be coming in. We will have to do some work. Our resources are very limited in a material or financial or human resources or expertise way.

485 So there will be a compensation made to the RCM so that we can play this watchdog role. So it is a requirement that we are presenting in order to meet and to do our work. I know that the Department of Environment is there with their specialists, but I would say that when you're close to the ground, it's preferable to do it ourselves.

490 So the RCM of Pontiac is also aware of the increased transportation or the traffic of the trucks coming in. As we said, Gatineau, on a political and administrative level seems to be interested more and more in the last few weeks. They've shown a little more interest. But it's difficult to know what kind of traffic is going to happen on the 105 or 301. But the RCM of Pontiac must be within a frame work that can ensure the safety of their people in that part of the territory.

495 Consequently, and to conclude, besides our support to the project, and in the brief that we have submitted, The Committee of Vigilance should be put in place at the beginning of the operation. That the RCM should receive their reports resulting from the environmental follow-

500 up on the part of the proponent or directly of the MDDEP. And maybe the BAPE could recommend to the trucking companies to evaluate the safety on the roads. And the proponents should work with the Ministry of Transport of Quebec and with the RCM, should look at all the modifications to ensure the peace and safety of its citizens.

505 And finally, that the promoters commit themselves to make sure that the LET... that the RCM guarantees that it will be well managed for the next ten (10) years and to have the financial measures that should be negotiated with us and with whomever it concerns.

THE COMMISSIONER:

510 (Translation) So my question - it is more of a technical question. You are going to generate in two thousand eight (2008), according to your brief, about seventeen thousand (17,000) tons of residual matter. And in applying the objective according to the policy of the government in two thousand eight (2008), the quantity of waste to be eliminated or to manage
515 would be in the order, or to treat, would be of six thousand (6,000) tons.

And so I would like to know, is it an objective that is realistic for you to reduce of eleven thousand (11,000) tons, or how many tons you think that you'll be able to manage?

520 MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

(Translation) I will answer on aspects that are a little more administrative. Mr. Duchesne will speak about the technical aspects, if you want.

525 But first of all, in the RCM there's a question of education, like in many places, in rural areas, some are more advanced than others. But I would simply submit that we have to have sums to put some educational programs and develop a strategy that is applied and applicable.

530 I will... the only example that I can give to you is that my assistant has put tens and tens of hours, and I thank him for his work, but Pierre Duchesne is not a specialist that has studied specifically in the environment field, so we probably need a resource person on that level. And our budget of two thousand seven (2007) we had anticipated that, but we weren't able to realize it.

535 And quite probably in two thousand eight (2008) we will have to hire a resource person in order to apply the matching plan and to develop strategies to educate the population. Strategies that involve all the eighteen (18) municipalities. And there's also a strategy in terms of governance with the mayors. I have only been around for six (6) months, so I'm convinced that this phase should be managed more with the RCMs than just on a municipal level. So it is
540 my group that will decide on the strategy and on a political administrative level.

First of all, these are the two (2) aspects that we're going to have to work on in order to reach our objectives of what has been mentioned.

545 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) If the site that is being proposed in the Municipality of Allevyn and Cawood, what solution would you have starting in two thousand nine (2009)?

550 MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

(Translation) First of all, we would be against the law. I don't know what the sanctions would be applied by the government. But at this stage of the game we did not imagine that we could not be according to the law or within the law. So it's very important to me. So, of course,
555 it's important for us too. We wanted to answer the legal requirements of the Quebec government. We didn't expect it otherwise.

But hypothetically, strictly hypothetically, if the site of Danford Lake was not retained, first of all, on a political and administrative level we would have to make representations to Mrs.
560 Beauchamp so that her department would lift the sword hanging over our heads. And we have discussed in the last few days, Mr. Duchesne and I, on looking around, just hypothetically, of course, in order to look for a Plan B.

And I come back to the financial capacity, once again. Nothing tells me, and I'm very
565 sincere, that at this moment that the MRC of Pontiac has the financial capacity to pay and to even look at other possibilities other than Danford Lake on a short-term basis.

So the data could be changed and the involvement of Gatineau could change the situation theoretically. And I don't want to talk on a political level. I'm talking about factual
570 level.

The Committee that we created for the table of the reeves met about seven (7) times. And Gatineau was invited every time and they only came twice. The task should not warrant the future. The political and administrative will didn't seem to be there except in the last few
575 days or last few weeks where there was a political view that was expressed at the table of the reeves. And a structure seems to be coming into place in order for Gatineau to be a partner. And so it looks like Gatineau would renew its contract with Lachute until two thousand twelve (2012) or two thousand thirteen (2013).

580 And when I had a meeting with the mayor, Mr. Bureau, in Gatineau, he didn't expect a new technology before the deadline of that contract.

So we are faced with the fact that our major partners and our big brother is imposing

585 on us, but he was not at the table in the last few months, except maybe in the last few days or few weeks.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

590 (Translation) Always in respect with this brief, page 5, when we look at the diagram, the residual waste, for the collection of this waste, do you make a difference between what is a municipal sector and industrial and commercial waste? In reality how is it done for the collection and the elimination?

MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

595 (Translation) I don't know if Pierre is aware. I will let him explain.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

600 (Translation) During the first part of the public hearings on the project, I mentioned that the philosophy was leaving some place for local initiatives in terms of reaching the objectives that derived from the law on waste from the government of Quebec. But we don't data of what's happening in other communities and other municipalities. And we count on them to get the information. And it's not the case. So it's difficult for us to look at this management plan.
605 Because we don't know, these municipalities don't necessarily know what they're collecting and what they're accumulating in their own territory.

610 But for you, you know very well and you've demonstrated very well at the other hearing, you have demonstrated your great knowledge of the Quebec government's strategy regarding the residual waste and their objectives. But that involves that the government is very well aware that organic matter is the biggest problem for the health and for the environment and for the smells, odours or for any other nuisances. And it set it at sixty percent (60%), which means that it involves that there is a separate collection or there's individual composting, which is not obvious everywhere, there's a possible reduction, yes.

615 And in each residence you have people who adhere to such a program. But to reach sixty percent (60%) you almost have a separate collection so that it doesn't go to the site, or have another approach for treating this waste. So the other range that exists other than the dump site.

620 We know that the transportation is a very important cost because that involves another system of collection, and these are important, significant points. So the rawness of your territory, individual collection of the compostable matter and what is generated here, which is two million (2,000,000) out of three point eight million (3.8 million), or three point five (3.5) out
625 of five point eight million (5.8 million) is the source of the problem.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

630 (Translation) The data that you have in the diagram 1 in the middle, when you're looking at compostable matter, which would be a third aspect, it's very difficult in a rural area given the enormous cost that it would generate.

635 We've discussed that aspect with the ad hoc committee that was created and put in place by the reeves of the Outaouais, and we agreed that it was not feasible for us to do this here. It was easier to do it in a place where more densely populated because of the cost that it generates.

640 We looked especially within The Committee and it meets with what you have in the diagram, and it goes with the question you asked. We looked at the technology of tri-composting. The fact that we collect everything -- I'm not a specialist in this field -- but I understand the principle, like you throw everything in, and then you can treat this matter. But to collect only the composting and separately is not feasible because it would cost too much.

645 It's already difficult to get the collection of residual waste and it's very costly. Very few municipalities were doing it. So to attempt to go into another avenue, on a third avenue, it would be very... it's not feasible, or it would be done with very great difficulty.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

650 (Translation) So should we expect to reach these goals? In the case that we opt for a dump site and that we put a cross on it, put a cross on composting and the recycling of or composting, because we're not going to do some individual collection?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

655 (Translation) What we have noticed in the rural areas, and it was part of our discussion at the table in our ad hoc committee, is that the objectives that are prescribed within the policy of the government of Quebec are not easily reachable in such a short term because of all the infrastructures that we will have to put in place, and we're talking about a system of collection. 660 And we're not going to be able to do this by the end of two thousand eight (2008). And there are some reasons for this. And there are several reasons, like the cost. And that's one of them.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

665 (Translation) Do you have some idea of how much time it might take, and not in terms of strict numbers, but your own vision, sir, for putting into place approaches so that the people have information on this subject, so that there can be, for example, receiving centres for

670 recycling, recycling centres for equipment for the... it would take what, five (5) years? Many years? Twelve (12) years?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

675 (Translation) Well, it's hard to calculate, ma'am, because, or determine because, first of all, there's a lot of work that has to be done to sensitize people. And a lot of education that has to be done both among the elected representatives and among the people. And, you know, we have to learn. And there are certain decisions that we learn about. And this isn't something that I'm saying to... as a reproach, madame. But when people become convinced that they have... that we have to reach these objectives, then that's when people will actually
680 do something about it.

So when we have succeeded in sensitizing and inciting people and convincing people to attain these objectives, then it happens quickly. It can happen in a short amount of time. If not, it will take five (5) or ten (10) years.

685

MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

(Translation) Well, I'm going back to what this question of the resources. And, you know, we need someone who has the training and the abilities who can put into place
690 structures and measures that will allow us to attain these objectives.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Well, in the first part of the hearings the promoter, the proponent
695 mentioned the minimum amount of waste that he would consider for a landfill site was a hundred thousand (100,000) tons a year. And you say that there is a critical mass of forty (40) to fifty thousand (50,000) tons a year is necessary to establish a site so that it can be viable.

And in your brief you mention that you say that a critical mass of ten (10) to twenty
700 thousand (20,000) tons per year would be sufficient to set up a technical landfill site. So is this recent information?

MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

705 (Translation) Well, that's what I understand, without going into LDC's strategy. But it's obvious, I think it's an open secret that having a site in Danford Lake would allow that enterprise LDC to be in a better position to get the business of Gatineau, if I can say "business". And so they can begin by giving, for strategic reasons, give a very low tonnage at the beginning, knowing that they would then be in a position to underbid other competitors and
710 get other clients, others than that of the Pontiac RCM. But I can't really speak on their behalf.

THE COMMISSIONER:

715 (Translation) So you say that you are recommending the technical landfill site, but only to be used in a temporary manner until the government finds a better medium and long-term solution?

MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

720 (Translation) Yes. Yes, I know, for example, one (1) reeve said, "You're not allowed to be against motherhood, you know." If there's a better technology that's cheaper, we may not have a lot of resources, but we've got enough intellectual curiosity to be on the lookout for better solutions when they come along.

725 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Okay. Well, thank you very much for your testimony, sir.

MR. ANDRE CORDEAU:

730 (Translation) Thank you, Madame Commissionaire and Chef, and thank you to your whole team.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

735 (Translation) Well, we now invite the spokesperson for the Municipality of Mansfield-et-Pontefract. Excuse me, it's the Mayor, it's the Mayor of Mansfield-et-Pontefract.

MR. RICHARD ROMAIN:

740 (Translation) Madame Chair and colleagues, we have tabled, the Municipality of Mansfield tabled a brief and we prepared a resolution, which I will now read.

745 Considering that the Municipality of Mansfield-et-Pontefract has a trench dump that is operated jointly with the Municipality of Fort-Coulonge which will soon close because of the end of its useful life, and because of the obligation to close it because of new requirements on treatment of waste in Quebec on nineteenth (19th) of January, two thousand and six (2006), we must find a way to treat our waste and to follow the rules set out by this new ruling on trench dumps. And we must adopt a new rule for waste treatment, to use re-usable and in
750 accordance with the decision of the Pontiac RCM and in keeping with other laws and resolutions.

And therefore we back the resolution of the Pontiac RCM for intermediate control and

for the implementation of a future technical landfill site is adequate and of regional interest.

755 And to consult the environmental impact study that was done by LDG Gestion and which has been judged receivable by the Minister of Sustainable Development of Quebec and to go to the first... to attend the first hearings of the BAPE that were held this spring.

760 And I myself brought up the fact that LDC has foreseen the construction for reception and transportation of... and for composting and for re-usable that would be attached to its technical landfill site.

765 And we have noted the fears and apprehensions of the local and regional population concerning especially the transport of waste on provincial roads 105 and 301.

And we are aware that LDC is ready to financially compensate Pontiac RCM for an amount that will be negotiated for each ton that is received at the future Danford Lake site.

770 And therefore other municipalities in Pontiac have the same urgent problem that we have regarding the use and treatment of our waste and management. And we cannot remain in the status quo for several years under the pretext that we have to continue consulting the population whether it be by hearings or by referenda. This has already been done by the Pontiac RCM when it adopted its waste management program, and by tabling a brief on the waste management and during the hearings of the BAPE, which is the best forum to allow
775 citizens to express their viewpoint.

780 And the council cannot allow itself to send its waste to far off sites such as Lachute or Ste-Sophie which are situated elsewhere than in the Outaouais, given that the ability of our taxpayers to pay is actually limited, especially in terms of overly expensive new technologies that have to be implemented near the centres of production such as Gatineau.

785 Therefore the Municipal Council unanimously adopted the following resolution on the sixth (6th) of June, two thousand and seven (2007). We ask the BAPE to positively recommend to the Minister of Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks the establishment of this technical landfill site in Danford Lake, and in keeping with what is set out by LDC and what is explained in these public hearings.

790 And we ask the BAPE that the Vigilance Committee that will be set up to ensure that norms are followed will transmit to our municipality a copy of the minutes of their annual report and so on.

795 And that we ask that the Minister of Transport to maintain highways 301 and 105 by giving the amount of money, giving over the amount of money necessary to maintain these roads.

And that we ask that the arrival of waste from other regions be properly controlled, as required, as specified by the future operator of this site.

800 And that we ask the RCM and Vallée-de-la-Gatineau, Collines-de-l'Outaouais to stop sending their waste to the lower Laurentians, which will allow us to get rid of our waste at a much more reasonable cost that will be much more acceptable for the taxpayers of the Outaouais. And this is in keeping with the laws and regulations adopted that said that we should be responsible in our own territory for our waste management.

805 And it was said that I would read this, as I have done, at this hearing. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER:

810 (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Mayor. What is the population of your municipality?

MR. RICHARD ROMAIN:

815 (Translation) We are two thousand and ninety-nine (2,099), but the neighbouring municipality are about seventeen hundred (1,700) in population. And we sort of work with one (1) site, have one (1) dump for both municipalities, so the garbage, the trash collection or the waste collection is done door-to-door.

THE COMMISSIONER:

820 (Translation) Yes, you do selective...

MR. RICHARD ROMAIN:

825 (Translation) Yes, we have recycling boxes. And people put it out in boxes and it is... we have done this for about six (6) years now. And the people are more sensitized to recycling.

830 On the other hand, as the Director General said earlier, we should spend a certain amount of money to educate people and to help encourage even more recycling on our territory.

THE COMMISSIONER:

835 (Translation) And these recycling boxes are where?

MR. RICHARD ROMAIN:

(Translation) Well, there are some at the landfill site. There are some that are

installed at strategic places in the municipality that are where people go.

840

And I might also add from my part, that my personal opinion is that a technical landfill site such as is being proposed is something which I personally believe we could be able to afford. As you know, there are two (2) plants that closed, two (2) factories that closed in our municipality, and the ability of citizens to bear the load is starting to be strained.

845

And I would like to say that our site is... our dump site is going to close soon and with BAPE and the environment and so on, I cannot believe that you would ever allow a proposal by LDC or others that wouldn't be acceptable.

850

Yes, there are other technologies, but can we afford them, that's what we as a municipality are worried about. And I think that at the regional level and in the short-term, we should give priority to something which is affordable and which can be realized.

855

And as I said at Lac-Ste-Marie to the LDC promoter, if the project goes forward and if the Minister agrees, if there's a possibility that it could be opened by the summer of two thousand and eight (2008), he said yes. So that's what we're interested in. And as a political administrator, we are trying to keep the taxes at a reasonable and affordable level for our citizens. Thank you.

860

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you, MR. Mayor. Thank you for your testimony. Now we would call upon Mr. Ken Molyneaux.

865

MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

Good afternoon, Madame Chair. My name is Ken Molyneaux.

870

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Before we start, I would ask you to speak slowly. That is to say, you can speak the normal speed, but please leave a little space between the sentences to give the translators a chance. Thank you, sir.

875

MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

My name is Ken Molyneaux. I was born and raised in Danford Lake. I now live in Kazabazua and own properties less than a kilometre from Danford Lake. This is my opinion

on the proposed landfill site that Mr. Rouleau wants to put at Danford Lake.

880

First of all, it shouldn't have went this far because everyone ignored the residents in Danford Lake, including the Mayor, councillors and the MRC. The residents told everyone they didn't want this project and offered to pay for a referendum.

885

Then at every meeting held on this issue the majority of people attending told everyone over and over again they don't want this project.

890

When everything got too hot for the Mayor of Danford Lake, he pushed everything onto the MRC. Shouldn't there also be an investigation into this? People are losing trust in the MRC and the government over this.

895

Mr. Rouleau told you and everyone else that there are no residences within two kilometres of the project, which you know is not true. Most importantly, that there are two (2) farms right beside the proposed project. I told you this at Mont-Ste-Marie then too. What else is he not telling you and everyone else the truth about?

900

Someone brought it to my attention last night and said on your site, the BAPE web site, that it says that there are no houses within two hundred (200) kilometres of this project. I hope you fix that huge lie. It's on your web site, sir.

905

We, and you know, that there will be an increase in rats that do follow waterways and carry diseases. There will be more seagulls which also are a nuisance and pollute the lakes and waterways close by.

There will be noise, air and ground pollution from the machinery working at the site. Pollution from the leachate into the ground water, the Picanoc River, which flows into the Gatineau, and many lakes and streams close by.

910

There will be an increase in heavy truck traffic, which will cause more damage to our already poor highways 105, 301 and 148. Am I going slow enough?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

915

(Translation) No, no, that's perfect.

MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

920

Thank you. You were also told a couple of meetings back that a residence in Kazabazua had to change many windows because of vibration from the heavy trucks that already pass through the village of Kazabazua.

925 I also had to re-surface and push out the basement walls of my house in Kazabazua, which is just as close to the highway as the person that changed their windows. I hope someone is going to pay for damages created by these big trucks that have to pass through many towns and villages with houses just as close as mine to get to this huge dump.

930 Shouldn't there be a survey done for the people that live as close as I do to the highway and see for yourselves how many people's houses shake from these big trucks, causing damage to their properties?

935 Increase in heavy trucks equals an increase in road accidents. We know this also to be true. I was also in an accident which, by the way, was the fault of the road conditions on the 105. There were four (4) to five (5) accidents the same weekend at the very same spot on the highway 105. One (1) person died in front of me when he flew out of his vehicle and landed on the road in front of my vehicle while my car was on fire and I was trapped inside.

940 Two (2) years before my accident my two (2) sons were involved in an accident on the 105. The car was cut completely in half by a half ton truck. One (1) son was pronounced dead at the scene of the accident, he was thirteen (13) years old. Thank God, it wasn't a garbage truck that hit them, they would both be dead right now. That is only a small part to that story. I hope you or no one else has to have the experience to wake you up. After the two (2) accidents they fixed the two (2) parts of the highway, or so they say.

945 You also make it sound like anyone that does not live within two kilometres shouldn't have a say or be affected by this huge project.

First of all, do trucks have to drive more than two kilometres to get to the site? Yes, affecting the rest of us.

950 Do seagulls fly more than two kilometres? Yes.

Do rats follow waterways, carry diseases for more than two kilometres? Yes, they do.

955 Does the Picanoc River flow more than two kilometres? Yes, of course it does.

Do deer, moose, partridge, geese, bear, wildlife, travel more than two kilometres? Yes, they do.

960 Will the animals that we hunt and eat, will they drink or eat from this project and get sick? Yes, I think they will.

That makes all of us affected by this huge project. And we have just as much say as anyone else.

965 I would also like to add that I am a proud Aboriginal within the meaning of the Canada
Constitution Act of 1982 and the provisions of the Woodland Metis Tribal Constitution. And I
also believe if you cut all the trees, pollute Mother Earth's waters, poison Her wildlife, you are
also poisoning all people and affecting their quality of life. If you let this happen, and I am
970 called upon, I will go to a war to protect this beautiful country of ours from being poisoned
more. We can afford other alternatives. You can't put a price on life. I would like my sister to
continue.

MS. LORRAINE MOLYNEAUX:

975 The point that I would like to add is regarding hazardous waste. I was a consultant
working on a pilot project for Environment Canada. The project that I was working on was the
track system. The track system was to tie into a manifest system to track hazardous waste as
it ventured across the country on our roadways. The problem is there is no manifest system.

980 The Director of Environment Canada made a speech to the House of Commons talking
about what a wonderful system the manifest system was and how many millions of dollars it
cost to create it. But I'm here to tell you firsthand that that system does not exist.

985 Because it doesn't exist the track system won't work. So, in effect, you can't track
hazardous waste as it travels across the country. Landfill sites are prime targets for the illegal
dumping of hazardous waste. And because the community is so small, mark my words, it will
be a target for the dumping of hazardous waste.

990 Another thing that's a concern is that many decisions are based on monetary value.
We can't afford or we can't afford, but it all boils down to monetary value. What value do you
put on a life? I understand that Danford Lake is a small community. And I've seen over the
years, especially working in government, that the few are always sacrificed for the many.

995 Many of the people, although there aren't many when you compare who want it and
who doesn't want it, but those who do want it have been fooled into believing that they're a poor
community. Well, they may be poor when you look at it in monetary value, but you can't put a
value on a life or your health. And really what it boils down to, would you rather be a poor,
healthy person who's alive or a rich dead person?

1000 Getting back to the monetary value, although many would argue the cleaner, safer
alternatives are too expensive, and I continue to hear statements such as, "We know it's better,
but we just can't afford it." For those who agree with these kinds of statements, I have some
exciting news. I have a notice from the Federal government entitled "Canada's New

1005 Government Highlights Budget Environmental Measures", that you may be aware of, dated
1005 March the twentieth (20th), two thousand seven (2007). This is a news release that states that
nine billion dollars (\$9,000,000,000.00) was allocated to find alternatives to what you're just
talking about.

1010 And one of them in a news coverage program on the CBC, they expressly stated
1010 plasma gasification. Four point seven billion (4.7 billion) were allocated since two thousand six
(2006) and another four point five billion (4.5 billion) in two thousand seven (2007). And for
those of you who may have heard this announcement, you are aware that these funds are to
be used for the very alternatives that you say you can't afford. Clearly, you can afford it and
now you know where the money is, and it's for this purpose. All you have to do is ask for it.
1015 Hopefully, this will settle the issue of "I can't afford it" once and for all.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1020 (Translation) Thank you. First of all, I would like to say that we are going to check
1020 whether there is an error in the BAPE site concerning this two hundred (200) kilometres. And if
there's a figure that is erroneous, I would like you to tell the analyst and we're going to have
them correct it.

1025 And secondly, we received the card following a question that was asked earlier, "Are
1025 there any residences less than two kilometres away?" If that question was asked, it's not
because the others have no right to do the discussion. It's simply to know exactly the people
who would be the most directly concerned by the presence of such site. And there is a
residence in fact in the radius of two kilometres.

1030 We do have a map. There might be two (2). But you can look at the map and see if
1030 what you have is the same as what we have received today. It's on the wall, behind, on the
left. You can look at it on the wall.

1035 I would also like to know if it was a technical dump site of a smaller magnitude, would
1035 you find it more acceptable or do you want to banish the whole idea of a dump site?

MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

1040 I don't think a landfill because the leachate and pollutions in ground water and pollution
1040 through the waters. And landfills are in the past. It's not for the future. That's my opinion.
There's other alternatives there. There's other people talked about. Why not look into them?
There's recycle, composting, gasification. People are just thinking about money, and I don't
understand that.

1045 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Whatever the process or the leachate, if we look at other means of incineration, like methane or tri-composting, there will always be volume of residual matter that we will have to dispose of. And for the time being, the best way was to have a technical site so they are stabilized products that do not... they've been treated, so they've been through some bioreactor or incinerator, so they've been treated. So, they've been through some bioreactor or incinerator, so they've been treated. So, you would still need a dump site, but for other material of another nature. So it's stabilized matter. And we're still going to need some technical dump site because I think it's... because that's the best way right now that we know of.

1055

MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

As long as you look at other countries to see what they're doing and what's working with other countries. And why can't we do the same?

1060

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) All the residual matter, waste, whatever the country, have the same problems as we do. But what's the percentage of this residual matter, I couldn't tell you for the time being.

1065

MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

Thank you.

1070

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you, madame and sir. We invite the person from the Yes Committee, Mrs. Latimer. Priscilla Kublek-Latimer.

1075

MRS. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

Good evening, Madame President and Mr. Commissioner. I am Priscilla Kublek-Latimer, a full-time resident of Alleyn and Cawood. And I live on Neil Lake.

1080

I am speaking here today on behalf of the Yes Committee in our community, for which Wayne Miljour is the President. Because of his work in the city and the long hours involved, he is unable to be here tonight.

1085

I am also speaking for persons whose opinion is one of approval for the proposed

engineered landfill project in Alleyn and Cawood. These persons have provided forms, signatures, letters and other relevant documents totalling ninety-eight (98) pages that I have previously forwarded to you as follows.

1090 Number 1) The Yes Committee form letters covering ninety-six (96) full-time residents.

1095 Number 2) A list of signatures, ninety-two (92) in total. And nineteen (19) of these are from full-time residents that are not duplicated on the form letters. Therefore, the ninety-six (96) plus the nineteen (19) is a total of one hundred and fifteen (115) full-time residents in favour.

 Number 3) Letters from seasonal residents.

1100 Number 4) Individual letters from full-time residents.

 Number 5) Letters from persons who are either full-time residents or closely connected to this community.

1105 Number 6) Letters from our Municipality of Alleyn and Cawood informing us about the proposed project and scheduled public meetings.

 Number 7) An e-mail from the Ministry of Health cancelling their speaker for our planned and already publicized EMC public meeting.

1110 And number 8) A letter dated April fifth (5th), two thousand six (2006) from the Environmental Management Committee that was posted in our community announcing that the EMC would not be holding any further meetings, discussions or research on this matter.

1115 I would like to point out just a few other opinions about this group of persons involved in the Yes Committee. They worked quietly, diligently and honourably and indicated that they respect each person's right to their own personal opinion.

1120 They held information sessions, attended meetings and used other resources to secure information about this project. They did not go outside our community to solicit help or support. They did not have large fundraisers to assist them financially. They offered and were prepared to provide information about the project upon request.

1125 They consulted the Environmental Impact Study and the transcripts of the first phase of public hearings. They visited the location of the future sites. They familiarized themselves with our new Quebec Landfill Law of January two thousand six (2006).

 When they had questions they asked for and they received full support from municipal

representatives and the promoter of this project. They feel that our local municipal representatives did the best they could considering the circumstances they were dealing with.

1130

They approached two (2) ministries of the government of Quebec to speak at a public meeting that we were arranging in order to provide information to the public concerning questions regarding health and environment. In both of those cases we were advised that we should wait for the BAPE to have answers to our questions. Therefore, they feel that all persons were treated fairly when they were told at our municipal level that we should wait for the BAPE to get answers.

1135

They have faith in our community to work together in the future as they have in the past. And to be actively involved with assisting to help oversee this proposed project that, in their opinion, should be approved. And they have faith in you and in our government of Quebec to respect our opinion and to endeavour at all times to protect the environment of our community and our province.

1140

We would also appreciate the BAPE to take into consideration the following. We are not the Nimby Syndrome, not in my backyard. We are aware that the Outaouais garbage must stay in the Outaouais. And that the site proposed by the promoter is one of the rare sites that respect all of the MDDEP selection criteria.

1145

We accept that the City of Gatineau and other MRCs will bring their garbage here because with the four dollar (\$4.00) per tonne levy, it will allow a large number of community projects for our municipality and our MRC projects. And these projects could never happen without this money.

1150

We don't believe we sold our souls to the promoter but rather, we believe that we are visionaries looking out for the future generations, and that we are taking advantage of a unique opportunity our municipality will never see again.

1155

We do not agree with the disinformation campaign concerning the environmental impacts of this project. For example, it's not true that garbage trucks will be a serious noise and safety problem. Nobody complains about the logging trucks.

1160

The same goes for the false information about a seagull problem. The contamination of the Picanoc River. The reduction of property values and other repercussions completely exaggerated as if no mitigative measures were taken to reduce these impacts.

1165

And we cannot afford an additional one hundred to one hundred and fifty dollars (\$100.00 to \$150.00) on our tax bills in order to bring our garbage to Lachute. Such an increase may not seem like much for seasonal cottage owners from Ottawa and Gatineau and elsewhere, however, many full-time residents here live on a fixed income and they cannot afford to pay more.

1170

1175

And finally, we urge you to take the time to clearly understand the meaning and extent of this brief. All of those who have signed the "in favour" letters will not be submitting individual briefs, as are those who are not in favour. We respect their point of view as they must respect ours.

1180

Considering the impressive quantity of briefs presented to the BAPE, ours is unique and it shows our solidarity. We do not believe that it is the quantity of briefs for or against that is essential, but rather the strength and pertinence of the justification of the project that we are convinced the BAPE will recognize. Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1185

(Translation) You came to certain meetings and you know that the people are concerned. Are you not getting the translation while other people are?

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

1190

I didn't get the very first part.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1195

(Translation) You heard during the public hearings... can you hear?

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

You heard during the public meetings, yes.

1200

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The fact that the people are worried and concerned for their health regarding the leachate and the green gas emissions and biogases. And everyone said yes, we should reduce the risk to the population.

1205

So do you feel that the public hearings will make it so that the people are more sensitive to the protection of the environment and will adhere more to the reduction and also the elimination of the waste that are possible to compost? Will they have used the public hearings to further reduce their volume of waste and create more composting instead of having it sent into the trenches, actually?

1210

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

I think that most likely these hearings, and if people are listening and paying close

1215 attention, are going to realize how very important it is to have the recycling and the reclaiming
and the composting. I think the composting part of this is going to have to really, you know, be
tackled and explained carefully to people and people be encouraged for it. Because it's part of
the... the biggest part of the problem.

1220 But I do think that sometimes with no matter what we're doing to try to reduce, people
fall into their old habits. They don't want to do something new that's a little more work, et
cetera, et cetera. And maybe in little... our communities will have to take a different measure,
like maybe levy a small surcharge if you don't compost, you know, something if they're not
doing it, then let's see if they would be more encouraged, you know. And that's how I feel
about it.

1225

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You are part of the Yes Committee, but are there concerns that you have
that come through amongst your members in view of having such a project, a technical dump
1230 site?

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

1235 Among the members that we have in our group, I find that we've taken a lot of time to
research and, you know, to research other areas, so to look at information from other cities in
the country, and I think that they feel comfortable. But also they feel we have to keep a very
close eye on this all, you know. We have to have, if we need it, the help of the government, if
we think there's a problem, you know, in this Vigilance Committee. But I think yes, they're
comfortable with it.

1240

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) But what is the interest as a resident of the Municipality of Alayn and
Cawood? What is the interest for you and for the people in your group to have this on their
1245 territory?

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

1250 I would think the main interest is that it would create an employment. And the number
may seem small, but we're a very, very small municipality and because of the large land mass
we have of Crown land we've got a very small tax base. So six (6) jobs may not seem like a
lot, you know, to someone, but to some of us it will be.

1255 And possibly, like what we're seeing looking into this, that other jobs will occur because
of it. For instance, the offers that are on the table but not signed agreement, that someone

could run the composting section of it there, you know. That different ideas, you know, that might come from it that would create work.

1260 And the other thing, the young people, they're all leaving. And over the last, more like say ten (10), fifteen (15) years as residents ourselves who are now reaching that early retirement age, we see everything sort of dying away. We don't have the youth to be the back-up like we were for our parents or grandparents, some of our group. So we wonder, what are we going to do? We're going to just, you know, crawl under a rock and we're all going to just do nothing here.

1265 And we think this project, this site being there will give us knew meaning to our life in the community.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1270 (Translation) What you've understood of what was told you, that project would create how many jobs total?

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

1275 We'll we've read, you know, different estimates of it. It's going to depend how large it's going to be, but up to fifteen (15) local jobs. There may be.. a couple of these jobs might have to be professionals who come from out of the area. But...

1280 It is a bit difficult, you know. I've been to all these hearings and I haven't heard this type. But this is what happens every time we speak anywhere. When we go out in public. When we go to our council meetings. And we are extremely tired of it and we really want the government to finish these hearings, hand in their report and make a decision. And we think the fact that we approve of it and we think it would be good is what we recommend. But some
1285 people don't want to hear anything, you know, or respect anyone else's opinion. And this is how it has been in our community.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1290 (Translation) We've noticed also that when the people who are not in favour, no one who were in favour came in the room to disapprove what they were saying. So we do not approve that situation. We want you to know that.

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

1295 And I do hope you've noticed tonight there has been no clapping.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1300 (Translation) Thank you, madame.

Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

Thank you.

1305

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you.

1310 Mrs. PRISCILLA KUBLEK-LATIMER:

Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1315

(Translation) So is Mrs. Odette Joly here?

Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

1320 (Translation) I am Odette Joly, and Mrs. Chair and Mr. Commissioner, I am a resident, permanent resident in the Municipality of Danford Lake for the last six (6) years. I am a permanent resident in the Municipality of Danford Lake for the last six (6) years, owning a cottage since nineteen eighty-six (1986).

1325 I'm presenting myself and my brief this way because the majority of briefs that you will receive will come from people who do not reside in a permanent manner in our municipality. The majority of those who are against this project are a small group of people who live in the city during the week in Gatineau, Ottawa or elsewhere in Outaouais and who only come here on the weekends once or twice a month.

1330

And I am there for part of the silent majority that hasn't come during the first phase of the public hearings because for us what is at stake in this project is not the same. And in reality, you really show that this project of the LDC are much more global and long-term than those of the coalition against the mega dump.

1335

For those who live twenty-four hours of twenty-four (24/24), twenty-four (24) hours a day, three hundred and sixty-five (365) days a year here, the issues are summarized here in the survival of our village. If we do not react to the coalition we risk simply the best

1340 opportunity... we risk missing the best opportunity that is presented to this population to save
our economy and the future of our municipality, simply because we will have been absent
during this BAPE hearing.

1345 So we have taken... we have looked at the impact studies in the library of the village
and we have also consulted the documents submitted duly arranged on internet. And the
answers provided by the experts to the questions of people who consider that this project
would have impacts on the environment, but that there are measures to protect any
environment will be put in place by LDC and the surveillance of the standards by the
1350 Surveillance Committee and by the management, regional management of the Department of
Environment and of Sustainable Development will allow to minimize and implement the loss
that apply.

1355 And this opinion is shared by a great part of the population that live permanently in
Danford Lake. And you will consult the brief of Mrs. Priscilla Kublek-Latimer and to look at the
surveys that we have done this year after having contacted people, person-by-person and the
permanent residents of the village. You will be able to look and examine these house surveys
or homemade surveys that's duly signed by the residents. And that a great part of the local
population who lives here permanently is agreeable with LDC coming to build and operate a
dump site that is expected to be built outside the village.

1360 I agree that the survey is not scientific. And it's not the equivalent of a referendum
demanded by the coalition. But the Commission will agree with me that the hundred and
fifteen (115) signatures of the citizens of Danford Lake that support the project is certainly
equivalent of all the owners of cottages who are outside of our municipality that is in
Kazabazua or on the 105, like ten (10) and twenty (20) kilometres away.

1365 Our association of permanent residents of Danford Lake is hoping that the BAPE will
consider the principle of equity in all the weight of that definition, that is to say, that they have to
consider the opinion of people who are for or against, like those are the people who are
against, like the people who cry much louder than the ones that we are representing.

1370 For us the two dollar (\$2.00) fee is a measure that will compensate financially and it's
not negligible for the future of our municipality. And the sum of five hundred thousand
(500,000) will allow to realize a great number of socio-community projects within our village for
thirty (30) years.

1375 We must therefore look at the pseudo impacts which are more virtual than real. And it
is very disappointing to see how public opinion is being manipulated by the "not in my
backyard" people. And how people are being frightened in our village who are afraid to sign
the petition because they're afraid of having problems with their neighbours, but many of them

1380 in reality agree with us that this is a very valid project and that we have to stop sending
garbage to other regions.

In conclusion, we hope that BAPE will also take into consideration the support of the
hundred and fifteen (115) permanent residents who are in agreement with the project. And this
1385 with the concern for fairness for all. The present brief is the spokesperson for all of the
members of our group. Now, I have a few things to say in English.

(Presentation in English)

1390 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Well, Mme Joly, in the brief which you have presented you count a lot on
the Surveillance Committee to ensure that the standards and environmental standards will be
respected. And so, how would you see this committee as working? Because the Surveillance
1395 Committee, in order for it to play its role adequately, I imagine it needs certain tools, it needs...

Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

(Translation) Well, the gentleman from the MRC spoke earlier and said that through
1400 the MRC they can have access to people who will be elected from the municipalities who will
be able to exercise surveillance and to work closely with the government to ensure that nothing
illegal happens at that site.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1405 (Translation) And then, for example, do you see how often... how often do you think
this committee would meet in a year? And do you think that the members of the committee
would have to visit the site?

1410 Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

(Translation) Yes, yes, and I think that probably these members should meet
frequently in order to really resolve any problems which might arise.

1415 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Are you talking about volunteer work? Would these people, since this is
an operation that be medium or long-term, should these people be paid?

1420 Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

(Translation) Yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1425

(Translation) Yes?

Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

1430

(Translation) Yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1435

(Translation) And if they want to do tests or if they want to carry on analyses for water quality let's say or for leachate or subterranean water?

Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

1440

(Translation) Yes, it's very important that it be done frequently, that this Committee of Surveillance do that frequently.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1445

(Translation) And how do you see the link between this committee and the whole of the population?

Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

1450

(Translation) Well, I think that if the MRC is part of the project, that each municipality might have one (1) representative who... that there would be no favouritism in the village. Each municipality would have a representative to ensure that everything is being done right and legally.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1455

(Translation) In Alleyn and Cawood are there speed limits? Is there a reduction of this speeds in the centre of the village?

Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

1460

(Translation) Yes, yes, it's fifty (50) kilometres an hour, yes. And then it's ninety (90)

when you get outside the village.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1465

(Translation) And is this being followed, according to you, or are there problems?

Mrs. ODETTE CHATEAUVERT-JOLY:

1470

(Translation) There are problems, I'm not going to deny it. There's been a bit more surveillance to get the big trucks to slow down on our roads. And there's been improvement, but there's room for more improvement, yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1475

(Translation) Thank you very much for your testimony, ma'am. Okay, so now we'll take a ten (10) minute break.

SHORT BREAK

1480

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1485

(Translation) So, Mr. Molyneaux, so following -- you can stay where you are -- so following the information which you have given us earlier, and thanks to the help of one of our interpreters, the information that you said... we saw the error, we found that error.

1490

So in the transcripts of the DT-1 in French at line 580 you can see that there is... that the promoter declares there is no residents within two kilometres. And on the other hand, in the English version DT-1.1 at line 511 you can read there are no residences within two hundred (200) kilometres. So tomorrow we will do everything necessary so that this mistake will be corrected as quickly as possible. And thank you for having underlined this mistake and this error. Thank you.

MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

1495

The two kilometre one is also false, I believe. Because there's two (2) farmhouses. There's the Tanner farm and the Graveline farm.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1500

(Translation) You are right. There is information which appears on a map that was tabled this week. And you can consult this at the back. So there is a correction that was made by Teknika.

1505 MR. KEN MOLYNEAUX:

Will that information be corrected also?

1510 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) We will ask the proponent to make a little note to explain this map in terms of the location of the farms and the two (2) cottages that are in this proximity.

Now, we will hear Mrs. Linda Cronk.

1515 MRS. LINDA CRONK:

(Presentation of brief)

1520 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Madame, at the moment when the council and the mayor was elected last time, what was his position in regards with the LET? And at that time did the citizens know, did they know the magnitude of the project that was proposed by the promoter or was it not known or was it mostly in the people's minds just a dump site that was equivalent to what you have in terms of the volume that you accommodate in the dump trenches?

1525 MRS. LINDA CRONK:

1530 There was a public consultation meeting put on by the promoter and municipality on October twenty-ninth (29th), two thousand and five (2005), four (4), five (5). A few days later the elections were held, municipal elections.

1535 At the public meeting it came to more general awareness that this was a bigger project than anyone had realized. A lot of people still didn't know the scope of the project and just really couldn't comprehend a dump that size.

1540 The... it was closed to receiving new nominations for running for council at that point and the council was acclaimed. I think the general feeling at that time was that we really... we trusted our council and our mayor to do the right thing and to consult with everyone. And I don't think anyone was worried at that point about the council and mayor.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1545 (Translation) But there were some public meetings when the project was presented before, before November two thousand five (2005), right? Public meetings and the mayor sent

a letter to all the citizens giving a presentation in detail of the project. Did you not realize the size of the project at that time? Or is it the information that was sent to you did not really let you foresee the size of the site that they were proposing to have?

1550

MRS. LINDA CRONK:

(Translation) In the letter sent by the mayor in October two thousand and four (2004) it was stated that the result would be the closure of one trench landfill and the implementation of an engineered landfill.

1555

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) What I'm saying is the letter sent for the public meetings held in October two thousand five (2005). I'm not talking about the meeting in two thousand four (2004). I'm talking about October two thousand five (2005).

1560

You received some information from the mayor and where you had a notice of that project that was presented and it should have had the information in regards with the project. And maybe it was not... or maybe you didn't pay attention to the information? Was it that the information was submitted to you, but that you didn't realize the magnitude of the project? Is that possible?

1565

MRS. LINDA CRONK:

1570

No one realized the magnitude of the project, no.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Even if you had the information? No one underlined the fact that it was a large volume? That it was another type of site? It's afterwards that gradually you realized the magnitude of the project? Is that possible?

1575

MRS. LINDA CRONK:

1580

That's correct.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

1585

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you for your testimony. Mr. Patrick Fowler.

1590

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1595

(Translation) Mrs. Chair and Mr. Commissioner, thank you for the opportunity of coming before you. My name is Patrick Fowler. I am here today to express the interests and the concerns of several interest groups. One the Fowler Family who is owner the 73 Chemin Thibault in Danford Lake. And the network of our family and the friends who have made this summer resort place the place that it is today. And the interests of the residents of this region who are entitled to a sustainable development or sustainable protection of their land and territory.

1600

I am opposed to LDC opening or implementing a dump site. My problem is the environmental problems and also the lack of management for this project and the lack of transparency in this process.

1605

For the environmental impacts, the bad management of the natural resources, pollution of water, of surface water, green gas emissions, rats, the transportation and the depreciation of the property are some of the factors that surround this project.

1610

They say that they propose a LET that will be thirty-five (35) hectares of forest use. And we conclude that the site will include two hundred and eighty (280) hectares during the thirty (30) years of operation. The site chosen is in the middle of a diversified species of forest and which is used for hunting, fishing and forest industry and agriculture.

1615

At the beginning of the project the spectators on the Mount O'Brien and the people who go on kayaking or canoeing will see waste and as we go into the future we will see this mountain of waste. And towards the end of the operation the size of the waste will be extremely high.

1620

And in respect with the transportation, it is inconceivable that they're going to go more than thirty-five (35) kilometres a day. There's also the congestion and the increase of the noise, the damages to the road and the risk of accidents and...

1625

So this in accepting the accommodation of hundreds of trucks on 105 and 301, who's going to pay the increased rate of the fuel, repair of the roads and also the payment on the side and so on? And the debate on the environmental impact does not define whether it pollutes or not, but to what degree. The promoter and all his experts admit that even a site that's well taken care of is going to create some pollution, but it is still according to the prerequisites of Quebec.

1630

And the other end of the platform, what is suggested with this LET it's that we're going to have catastrophic consequences in future. But to remain under the norms and to minimize

the impacts on the environment we have to work very hard at it. You need an operation method and maintenance and the vigilant supervision and very scrupulous maintenance.

1635 So when we realize that we want to use a concept that goes back to nineteen seventy (1970) with the nordic technology of nineteen eighty (1980) for a sustainable solution, wouldn't it be simpler and more efficient and wiser to have better sustainable ideas to look after the future in using better technology than to use one of the past?

1640 And there seems to be a lack of strategy on the part of the region. On the thirtieth (30th) of September, two thousand (2000) The Gazette in Quebec has issued the policy of management for residual waste until two thousand eight (2008). And in this publication the government of Quebec underlined the fact that they should improve how to treat the waste in the province.

1645 Certain principles, basic principles are... and answers the fact that we should do more composting, more recycling. And the closure of trenches, dump trenches, this is what they wanted to do. And this is going to help and conserve the resources and instruct the public on what can be done to help and improve the situation.

1650 When we start talking about sustainable development, we look at the waste as a potential source of energy and a sustainable development. We know that they should be separated and treated as close as possible to the source in order to allow the efficient use of the energy, reducing the transportation and to minimize the need for a dump site.

1655 Why do we consider a technical site that burns and incinerates waste and that is at a hundred (100) kilometres further than the dump site in respect with the quality, the law and the quality of the environment in two thousand two (2002)? They should update really that plan. And we should develop a plan that is adapted to regional needs which would be to maximize like compostable and recyclable items.

1660 So the RCM of the Vallée of Gatineau proposed their plan for a disposal of waste and they proposed a site that would be better than the trenches dump. And they said it will be more favourable for the region. And RCM Pontiac said that they didn't make any commitment to the site and continues to assess other options.

1665 And Gatineau published in October two thousand five (2005) that they would maintain Lachute as their dump site until they find an adequate solution. And while waiting for a solution they will continue the incineration, the usages or processes that are closer to their city. But there's no indication that it is the solution that is desired with this dump site.

1670 Why do we discuss all the time of this LET in Alayn and Cawood if the regions do not identify the technology in question as a favourable one? The RCM have not determined what

1675 is the best or most appropriate solution. The option, is it just considered because time is running and the RCM have taken too much time in producing their plan? Are their conclusions going to be ignored in order to take a rapid solution that will have permanent consequences?

1680 And once the LET will be created the damages will be done. And in that case it will be very hard to break a commitment made with the supplier even if the plans from the RCM exclude the LET. And even once it's in place we will attract other people to come and dump their waste outside of Quebec, like from demolishing companies in Ontario and so on.

1685 I don't believe the RCM are ready to unveil their plan and management of waste. That's what I've heard during the hearings. I'm sceptical that none of them see a LET as a management of waste. And I would go even further, I would say most of the people think that a LET is an archaic solution. I say it again, why are we here?

1690 Thirdly, there's a lack of transparency in the process. It is worrisome the way the promoter went to a small community with something that was unsolicited and gained access to a crown property. Now, the impression that the interests of a private business and a small group of citizens locally are more important than the community as a whole are more important.

1695 There's no evidence that a LET is expected by the regional government. And there's not been bids or tenders and the taxpayers will need to be ensured that their opinions will be respected because we are allowing our public funds to be used. And we need to understand why it's been considered and by this supplier of services.

1700 The responsibility went on the shoulders of the population who have to look at the characteristics, at the potential solution while we knew it was the responsibility of the RCM to do a plan and develop a plan for managing this waste. It's terrifying to think that this could have gone unnoticed if the citizens become involved.

1705 In summary, this site must be stopped. There were no regional strategy that has identified the need for such a site. There's a lack of transparency in the process. And the impact on the environment is unacceptable and enormous. This proposition does not answer to the solution that we need for disposal of waste. But if the project is accepted, the benefactors are going to be only the shareholders and the environment and the communities and its citizens will be paying the consequences for hundreds of years to come after that.

1710 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) What are the reasons, in your mind, are we at this stage... we have the elected, we have the administrators. They knew the regulations. They knew that the deadlines would soon be coming. And to put in place a solution that you would judge more

1715 acceptable on an environmental level can't be done in delay... not even in a two-year delay.
Isn't it why, like an RCM who is further will have more serious problems than those who are
closer to the elimination centre find themselves against the wall, to use their words?

1720 Someone from the RCM, who are trying to find a solution that could be... that could
materialize on the short-term, is it a lack of consultation on a regional level that has lacked and
created a situation?

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1725 (Translation) Possibly. We don't know what we really want. We don't know if we want
a LET. We don't know what are the options and are proposed one (1) option and only one (1).
And we are left with a lot of questions and a lot of concerns regarding this project.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1730 (Translation) If we are here and if we have this project, it's not the responsibility of the
public administrators within the region of the Outaouais who have slowed down or delayed the
possibility to have a solution?

1735 MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

(Translation) Possibly. And for that reason I would thank them. But we haven't heard
that they are offering other solutions. We were offered only one (1) and that's a real concern.
If we were offered other options, maybe we wouldn't be here. But we are here to look at the
1740 options, to find other solutions, one that is convenient for everyone or acceptable for everyone.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1745 (Translation) And you encouraged maintenance of the dump trenches for the time
being?

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

(Translation) Not really. I think that the intention behind this project are a step in the
1750 right direction. But as I said, if I have to, I would rather have dump trenches for a year than to
live with a solution like the proposed one for a hundred (100) years.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1755 (Translation) There was an inquiry on the residual matter disposal. And at the time --
it's about eleven (11) years ago -- it's evident that the region was supposed to do some

consultations to try and find solutions.

1760 How the Minister of Sustainable Development of an environment and protection of the parks, how can she ensure that there will be a solution that will be developed, that we're not going to have to wait another four (4) or five (5) years until the contracts have expired to say once again we haven't done the consultation, we haven't done the work and we have to go through another five (5) years sending our waste outside of the region?

1765 What is the approach that we should have so that the regions will define a real strategy and convinces the Minister that you will define the path that you would like before three (3) years?

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1770 (Translation) So are you asking me what measures I would put in place?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1775 (Translation) What would make it so that the person who's responsible at the government, the person responsible who is the Minister of the MDDEP, how could she have the information to see that the region is developing a potential regional solution that will be acceptable socially?

1780 MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

(Translation) I don't really understand, but if you're asking me how can the Minister of Sustainable Development and say this is the one that the regions want?

1785 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1790 (Translation) No, I'm not talking about the way to do it. I don't think that the Minister says, "This is the approach. This is a dump," and so on. What could we do so that she would say, "Yes, I have faith that the region will develop or come up with a solution and will be able to propose something reasonable and soon,"?

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1795 (Translation) I guess you would have to show the options that have been shown to the public and that the money from the public was spent in a proper manner to achieve a solution and to come up with a consensus. And then, if that decision, and if it is a LET, then I would hardly think that the people would have reservations on that. But what would be the process that would have been undertaken?

1800 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) We heard during the hearings that the tables of the reeves or the wardens was meeting to examine these questions. Do you believe that it's important that the reeves or wardens would give to the public what they've done and what they're going to do?

1805

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

(Translation) Certainly not. I would expect for the regional government looks after the situation and offers the public the options that they've researched and found and that they consider to be better. They looked at the financial aspects, the social aspects. And then it's up to them to propose something. Then I would understand that they have undertaken some process that shows that they have come up with some options.

1810

I want transparency. I think we need transparency in terms of the LET that we're talking about now and that's what I would really like, at least.

1815

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) For other options as well?

1820

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

(Translation) Well, I would expect so.

1825

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) In the region, if there's some process in place to find out some solutions, some mixture of solutions, if you like, how can we ensure that the process is really going to happen?

1830

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

(Translation) True conferences with the public, like we're having now. We have access to information. We hear from experts who give us answers, the answers that we're seeking. And there we're able to express our opinion on the options.

1835

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So you're hoping that this process in the region will be done in consultation with the public?

1840

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1845 (Translation) So it is an issue that concerns a lot of people. Yes, there should be transparency in the whole project, and all the options should be presented in consultations with the public.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1850 (Translation) Thank you for your testimony.

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1855 (Translation) Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Albert Davies.

1860 MR. ALBERT DAVIES:

Albert Davies, the Mayor of Bryson. Madame, Monsieur, thank you very much for hearing us. I want to compliment you and your Committee, the job you're doing. And keeping a very low but a prompt profile at your meeting here, so I've heard a little bit of snickering once or twice and you corrected it right off. I compliment you on that. You've done a wonderful job. And it's great for the people to come here, if they're for/against or whatever.

1870 Going back to my background. I'm a stationary engineer. I worked forty and a half (40½) years in pulp and paper industries, plants from Nova Scotia to Quebec. I'm fully aware of borders, scrubbers and electronic precipitators.

1875 There was two (2) big things on my mind for my municipality. 1) What type is going to get rid of our garbage. I've heard from a lady that worked for the government in the environmental about incinerators, which you have up in northern part of Quebec. Either a twenty-four (24) or a fifty (50) ton, two (2) of them 24-hour operation. You have to go with an electronic precipitator and a scrubber because of the different chemicals from being burned from plastic bags and so on. The ones in north there, they didn't have a scrubber because of the marshlands, no place for a lagoon.

1880 I was really concerned about that part because it takes a lot of water for a scrubber. And what do you do with the by-product of the water? You have to have a lagoon, and where does that go to. The other thing is the by-product. There's no sale for that. That would have to be trucked to Lachute.

1885 The other part is the plasma. Going back in the late eighties ('80s), nineties ('90s) I was on a committee for going... producing power at Consolidated Bathurst. At the same that City of Hull was going for a co-generating plant. The government, as we know, owns Quebec Hydro, although it's privately owned. At that time they didn't need them, they felt they didn't need to buy them.

1890 So going to the plasm... going back to a plasm plan, in order for it to be functionable, it need twelve cents per kilowatt (\$0.12/kw) from the Hydro. And knowing Hydro, being involved - I've been retired since 1996 - its co-generating plan, that it looks like that because we needed that even at our plant at that time, a company was coming in and putting it in. And
1895 we would have got the power for our plant and sell it to Ontario Hydro, but yet we asked permission from Quebec and that was put to a stop. So I'm familiar with the three (3) processes of getting rid of our garbage.

1900 My other main concern was, as you remember a few years ago there was going to fill the old mine in Bristol. The people didn't want it. I've listened to the MRC meetings monthly, when we had our meetings, people for and people against. My main concern, where will we go and what type? Do the people want it in their area. Because we have to work together as eighteen (18) municipalities the MRC. I believe in that. Because we're a very small municipality.

1905 Over fifty percent (50%) of the permanent residents in Danford were in favour, said that's fine. They want that. I listened to them here tonight too, and I've heard them several times, the pros and the cons against it. So my mind said fine. I've been in different sessions to LCD with their liners and so on and so forth, waiving the other two (2) I'm saying. I believe
1910 that's the best option for me to be in favour of.

1915 We passed the resolution in June, went on to the MRC Municipality of Bryson in favour of LCD for the dump in Danford. Going in and trucking. Our bread and butter in this whole area is the bush. Trucks are travelling all over 148 and all over it. I live in the subdivision of Bryson off of 148. The big trucks at night, so that's the time vibrate in my house. I have a big brass bed in the bedroom. I hear it vibrate. That's our bread and butter.

1920 Regardless of what type of operation you have for garbage you're going to have trucks, transport no matter where, so it doesn't matter.

1925 In Municipality of Bryson we're seven hundred and thirty-two (732) population. We recycle. We've been recycling for thirteen (13) years. We used to have a contractor come in and pick up. We used to fight and argue with the people. I said no, we're going to do it ourselves. We have eleven (11) bins full transported to Hull every two (2) weeks. We pick it up ourselves because when we had a contractor it had to be folded for cardboards and so on.

I want the people to recycle. We don't worry about that. We'll tramp it in the bins ourselves to get the people recycling. Because we have to rent the land for our dump. We rent from the Municipality of Clarington.

1930 We have to have a good vehicle. It's a two thousand six (2006) truck. We have to pass the scale house loaded and empty we have to stop. We never have a problem, a fine, it's not being covered properly or anything. Thank God, because we can't afford to pay the fine.

1935 So looking at what type of operation, we support LCD for this in Danford. We support it on two (2) reasons. The majority of the population want it for them. We are on a water project, portable water and a sewer project. One is three (3) and one is five million (5,000,000). Money from the government. It's tough because the landowners were discussing there for more money for our water, portable water. And we have to go and expropriate, it's coming from another municipality, expropriate the land because the person don't want to sell and there's no money on that part.

1940 When I look at the costs for our garbage, waiving no matter which way we go, we have to. Our recycling is very big and we do... we have to go to compost. I believe in that, so a lot of the people were composting in their yards and that created rats even with their compost.

1945 They weren't looking after it properly.

Being from down east, they do it all... all three (3) of them and separately. We have to do, and I believe that. And LCD will do that in time.

1950 We will transport our own stuff there. But we have eighty percent (80%) less garbage than we had ten (10), twelve (12) and eight (8) years ago now because I even get my men to check the garbage once it's on the truck, this place is no recycling. And I get lots of calls saying, "Hey, you're not allowed to open up our garbage." I said once it's on our truck I'm allowed to.

1955 So I'm very strict and I have a councillor and he knows that. I even went door-to-door and I said we must because we rent the land. We don't have a dump in our own municipality. We rent the land. We have to keep it very clean. And I know with the environment because we're very fortunate, we have a municipality where we can rent and dig the hole and maintain it ourselves. And we have to keep it very clean. I thank you very much for hearing my presentation. And you've had a long evening, thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1965 (Translation) You have made great efforts in your municipality to reduce the volumes. And you are right now... you said you have an objective of eighty percent (80%), a goal of eighty percent (80%). You have exceeded the government objectives, if I understood you

1970 correctly. And could you also tell us where your municipality is located on the map? Do you have a pointer there? I will give you a pointer. We'll give you a pointer there, sir, if you'll show us where your municipality is on the map.

Please stay where you are, sir, stay at your seat. Sir, you need the microphone. You need to be using the microphone, sir.

1975 MR. ALBERT DAVIES:

In between Campbell's Bay and Shawville, right about there. And we go all the way down 148 in the back of Clarington for dumping. In the Municipality of Clarington. Excuse me, ma'am, sorry about the mike.

1980

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1985 (Translation) And now concerning the goal of reduction of waste. You said that you had reduced considerably your waste, the objective. If I understood correctly from your testimony, you are now at eighty percent (80%) reduction? That would be even more than the government's goal?

MR. ALBERT DAVIES:

1990 Going back here about thirteen (13) or fourteen (14) years ago, we had a five-ton truck. We used to haul five (5) loads a week. We have a one-ton Dooley now. We take two (2) and sometimes two and a half (2½) loads to our dump per week.

1995 But the outfit in Gatineau takes our recycling. It's very, very good. We're able to recycle everything. And we keep a very close eye on them. My two (2) employees that work on this and we're very strict. Three (3) men there takes them roughly six (6) hours to fill the bins from picking up each home. And we give the people the boxes. A lot of the senior people the second box we charge them an extra ten dollars (\$10.00). I say no, no, use a cardboard box. Save your money. I want them to recycle.

2000

THE COMMISSIONER:

2005 (Translation) This reduction of the volume of garbage, of waste that is transported, could it also be due to the fact that your population produces less waste in addition to your efficient recycling program? Could it be that you also have been producing less waste over the past few years?

MR. ALBERT DAVIES:

2010 We have a senior's residence, fourteen (14) apartments. That's normal since day one.

They're either doubles or singles and senior people don't produce that much.

2015

Our population in the last eighteen (18) years has dropped from eight hundred (800) to seven hundred and thirty-two (732). A lot of our seniors have passed on or moved into homes... out of their homes and lost their spouse and so on and we've had new people come in and moved in from other communities that are working for the CLSC or the government, various bureaus have moved into Bryson.

2020

Mostly the day, one time when I came here in sixty-seven ('67) you had families ten (10) and twelve (12) and fourteen (14). And in a family today you got one (1), two (2) or three (3) young families and that's it.

2025

I would say on the whole, no, it's because our pushing for recycling. And the main thing is that we don't have our own land for our garbage and we had to do something.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2030

(Translation) You said that no matter where the site for the elimination of waste is situated that you'll always need trucks to transport it. But if the site for the elimination is where you produce the least of it, then is there not a way of lowering the amount of truck transport by putting the elimination site there where the population is dentist? Would you not agree with that? That way there would be fewer trucks that have to travel long distances all over the territory of the... over the land.

2035

MR. ALBERT DAVIES:

2040

In a sense too because the most populated areas in our MRC would be Fort-Coulonge and Mansfield and Shawville and the Municipality of Clarington. I can't recall if Otter Lake and Bryson is around this thing.

2045

I guess going back what you're saying, it's a short distance for us to travel to Danford Lake because we figure, hoping this would go through, anyways, that we would build a low profile flatbed with a dump on it and make one (1) trip a week, along with our new Dooley.

But in lowly "densit" areas like we have, I agree with you that you don't have that much traffic. But it has to go somewhere and where?

THE COMMISSIONER:

2050

(Translation) But my question really was that whether you think it's a regional solution that should be... that is put into place and that we have to treat the waste globally... if we have to have a regional solution for the whole... for all the MRCs, would it not be more reasonable

that the... given that Gatineau produces seventy-five percent (75%) of the waste?

2055 So if you put an elimination or a treatment centre in that spot, you'll need less transport, obviously, overall you will need less transport if they only... there will be fewer trucks that... then, obviously, there will be trucks going from the MRCs that are in the north towards Gatineau.

2060 But, obviously, if you're taking them from Gatineau to the north, there will be a lot more trucks travelling, isn't that right?

MR. ALBERT DAVIES:

2065 Yes, they would travel 105, I think it is, and the other side coming up that way is shorter. Yes, you've got to see, you have to be realistic, that's for sure, you know.

2070 But the City of Gatineau, because I have a friend that's an environment engineer has a cottage across from me, and I know they've been negotiating with Lachute, and their contract runs out in two thousand and eight (2008) in June, I think it is, or July, I forget now what he told me. And they're looking to renew the contract. But I think they're thinking about railing it or whatever to Lachute. Because I know they load their trucks for Lachute.

2075 But, yes, I agree with you on that. And that's understandable. It's common sense, as far as that goes. But this is a great... speaking on behalf for the MRC to Pontiac and the people, you know, and the majority of the people want it. And I have to along with it. It's good for all of our MRCs because we have to work together as a municipality. We're a small... we're sixteen thousand (16,000) population under MRC. So we're very small municipalities.

2080 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you very much for your testimony, Mr. Mayor.

2085 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The last testimony will be Mr. Gilles Pelletier before the correction or rectification period. While you are getting ready, Mr. Pelletier, is Mr. Michel Turcot in the hall perhaps? Is Mr. Michel Turcot here? No, he isn't?

2090 So I will ask your cooperation. There are five (5) people registered after you for rectification and we have to close off at eleven o'clock (11:00). So we will ask you to please make your presentation in the course of twenty (20) minutes, to limit your intervention to twenty (20) minutes, please, sir.

2095 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) Good evening, my name is Gilles Pelletier. I live in Gatineau and I have a secondary residence on the Picanoc River in Danford Lake. And on the map it is identified as number 3, in the map on the wall. Behind these trees we want to build a dump. I don't...
2100 and I wonder if anybody told the beavers they're going to have to move. And in front of that you see that the water is not very deep and the water is very shallow on quite a large area, so they'll have to... you have water right up to your navel wherever you go there.

My nephew who's eleven (11) he came to the cottage and we went fishing a couple of
2105 weeks ago. And I told him that there was going to be a dump there behind him, and he said, "C'mon, Uncle. The fish are going to eat this filth and then we're going to eat the fish, is that what you're telling me?" And finally, I hope that we will be able to eat fish that are not too poisoned.

2110 This is another view of the cottage. It's been there for almost forty (40) years now. And it has been handed down from family to family from there in that spot.

So I'm interested in this project because it's going to change our quality of life for me and my family. Just as you can see it's a cottage on the Picanoc River. We hunt, we fish, we
2115 love nature. And wind, also the wind always comes from the southwest, which means it's going to come from the site and bring all the odours towards us.

The proposed site and also where they're going to have the leachate, it's going to be right in front of our dock where we actually go swimming. Is this acceptable or not? I don't
2120 think it is acceptable in the area where they want to put it because of the soil, because of the proximity of the river and the streams. There are too many animals who need that water to survive. And in the summer the water is so low we can see that the water's not... there's hardly any water in summer.

2125 So a word is a thousand words. Is it acceptable or not? No, as far as I'm concerned, the soil is sand and gravel and it's like a disaster to happen.

We have to underline that the fauna and the flora are present, and we haven't really talked about so much. There are lots of birds right now and they come and lay their eggs
2130 nearby, and ducks and geese and turtles, and so the river is very important for the animal life.

I have pictures, you have deer who come drinking in front of the cottage. And the option will have a major impact on the environment. And a membrane cannot be the solution for a site that should have been in clay soil and argyle. And the promoter says that it's going to
2135 leach so many litres a year. And it's not acceptable, not even a drop. I wanted to bring a drop of colouring and put it in your drinks and ask you taste it afterwards. I don't know if you would

have wanted to drink it.

2140 So the proposed options, for me there will never be a better option than a high density incinerator. With this system we're against the technology, the upcoming technology. And the Quebec people have a right to it and we should create an environment that has less risk by doing this. And we're entitled to it.

2145 And the elements of the project that should be modified... the whole project should be modified to give the people in the region the pleasure of having a project that is a much better or more adequate for their needs. It creates a lot of tension for all the people in this region. And if the project was to be authorized, as far as I'm concerned it should not be, because from the beginning there's been all kinds of things done in the wrong way in this process. We have taken the people of Danford as idiots and making them believe anything they wanted.

2150 A suggestion, I would have liked for you, the people of the BAPE, to come on the river to come and see the proximity of the site to the river and to see the point of pollution that this site will create and visible for everyone who goes along the river. And if the project goes ahead, from the river we're going to see the machinery that goes back and forth. It will be like
2155 a construction site because we'll be able to see it from the river.

We're going to have all this waste spread all around in a mound of two hundred (200) feet high. Higher than anything else around.

2160 So my last word, I would like to conclude with the sentiment that I have done whatever I could, the most possible. Maybe there's still time. We have a year and a few months left to find another solution. Maybe we put everyone in the same room and we close the door and we find a solution. It's not that complicated.

2165 So a few years at that, since the beginning of this saga, and a lot of people have put a lot of hours of work to show that it's not acceptable. And other options have been proposed and I hope that we will be heard.

2170 I asked questions during one hearing, and I had two (2) answers. Two (2) questions that did not get an answer. And today when I arrived I found the answer on the walls. I was really happy.

2175 I thank all the people who really, really worked on that process, and you, Mrs. Chair and Mr. Commissioner. I hope that our comments will have brought some light and you will be able to make an enlightened decision. And please do not mortgage the future of our children and our grandchildren. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2180 (Translation) Mr. Pelletier...

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2185 (Translation) This is a map with all the mining titles. You have four (4) little squares in blue. We see them everywhere because there's a little explosion of mining because people find uranium in the area. And the project that's being studied, this is where they're going to put the site. So I did find that and so I just wanted to show you. I don't know what it means. So I know that someone's going to work there to do some digging. Maybe they will have to finish this digging before they do the project.

2190

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Is that the same place as they're going to have... are they digging right now?

2195

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2200 (Translation) From what I see. Some are being added, I wouldn't say every day because it takes a little while before you get a claim. It could take up to two (2) years before you can get your claim. You can't just push a button. It takes two (2) months of studying it before you can get the right to that claim or you can recognize your claim.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2205 (Translation) Mr. Pelletier, just one question. You're talking about a technology for treatment of waste. And I think as a promoter of technology that has done its job very well, would you have liked to have a representative of the... to present some other technologies?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2210

(Translation) I would have really liked to.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2215 (Translation) So that we could make a choice or to compare.

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

At the present time there's a machine in Ottawa and it's operating and it creates

2220 electricity. And Quebec gives more to the kilowatts... more than Quebec. Maybe that's what the problem is because they give more to promote the system.

If I bought a car I will make sure that there's air conditioning in it and maybe a little more gadgets. So you're going to choose the best technology even if it's the most costly. I think in the long run, let's say you have a Volvo, if you get hit you have a much better chance to survive than if you are in a Lada.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2230 (Translation) I understood that it was a technology that's being demonstrated right now. And one of the problems that it could generate is that it could slow down on the whole regional level the implementation of a system to be put in place.

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2235 (Translation) The incinerators...

THE COMMISSIONER:

2240 (Translation) The incinerators, like the tri-composting, for example. We're not comparing the technologies, but we're always talking about... we're hearing all about the same technology.

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2245 (Translation) I visited a site in Ontario and the site is on twenty (20) feet of clay. Nothing can go under. They have done some channels or dug some... it's a dump, but the work was very well done and the juice doesn't go anywhere. It's really brought into the same area. And if they have too much, they can send it to a water treatment centre. They've arranged to treat it. It's not really pleasant to look at it. There are fences of twenty (20) feet high to collect the plastic bags. It's really terrible and it smells terrible, but that's what you need. I think we can do a bit better than that.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2255 (Translation) I have no other questions. Thank you, Mr. Pelletier.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2260 (Translation) I just want to rectify some information that you gave. You said that from the information that, "I see on the map my cottage... my water connection it just," you said on a mount which is before...?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2265

(Translation) Before, yes, so you're right. Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2270

(Translation) Thank you. So we are at the rectification period. Raye Thomas.

MR. RAYE THOMAS:

2275

Commissioner, there are two (2)... there are two (2) corrections I'd like to make. One is related to comments by Mr. Labrie during the course of these hearings.

2280

On several occasions, monsieur, you have referred to the fact that even though you have a technology such as plasma gasification you would still need a LET to bury the residue from that plasma gasification plant.

2285

The residue from the plasma gasification plant is essentially a glassy material which has been well tested in Europe and North America and around the world. It is totally stable. There's no possibility of leachate from it. No possibility of gas creation. The material itself is possible to be used in concrete and asphalt in other building materials. So any operator of a plasma gasification site would attempt to sell that material. If he were unsuccessful in selling the material...

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2290

(Translation) We understood your point. We have to make it brief, please.

MR. RAYE THOMAS:

2295

Okay, my correction says that you do need a LET. If you had to bury that material, you do not need a LET because it is totally stable.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2300

(Translation) One comment. All the residual matter cannot be collected and directed towards a treatment centre, there's always a part that must be disposed of. And that was the thought behind my question. There's always some residue that needs to be disposed of and that you have to send to a treatment centre.

MR. RAYE THOMAS:

2305

The other correction I wanted to make was we had a quotation by Ms. Kublek earlier tonight, stated that... she stated that you could not afford the hundred and fifty dollars plus (\$150.00+) costs to send garbage to Lachute. We do have an offer in front of the Pontiac that offers to treat that garbage at the same rate as for the City of Gatineau. The transportation cost, the site which would consolidate the load and the cost of treating the garbage, burying it in Lachute works out to sixty-five to seventy dollars (\$65.00 to \$70.00) a ton.

2310

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2315

(Translation) Thank you. Mr. Renato Livinal, please. No? Charlene Scharf.

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

2320

Good evening. I just have two (2) things I'd like to clarify. One was stated by the Yes Committee, when they quoted a number of a hundred and fifteen (115) had signed their petition or their survey allowing the dump, this had to include children under the age of eighteen (18), as the census in two thousand and six (2006) indicated that we only had a hundred and eleven (111) on our electoral list at that time. So I'd just like to clarify that it included children.

2325

And the other clarification I'd like to make is for the Mayor of Bryson. As we know, there was no referendum and no formal survey done by the municipality to find out the percentage in the municipality that were for it. So his statement of over fifty percent (50%) is debatable and it's hearsay. Thank you.

2330

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you. Mr. André Poulin, please.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2335

(Translation) The first rectification is a technical one. In terms of the dimension, we have informed The Commission already that the dimensions, the exact dimensions of the LET are not two hundred and eighty (280) hectares, but as written in the document on the impact study on page 201, five hundred and twenty (520) meters by seven hundred and fifty (750) meters, which gives thirty-eight point five (38.5) hectares. There's quite a difference with two hundred and eighty hectares (280 ha).

2340

And the second rectification is in terms of the chronology. In the impact study it is written that in the appendix of the impact study there was a period of consultation before giving

2345 the proposed project to the minister at that time. The consultation, the second one took place on the twelfth (12th) of March, two thousand five (2005).

That consultation, I was there present, and our group was there. We wanted to consult the population to ask them their opinion before presenting the notice of project, which was
2350 presented, submitted the week after.

If you read it, in the impact study you see the capacity of two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) tons including the City of Gatineau. From May to November two thousand five (2005), that is the period where the election took place, we have seven (7) months. And
2355 during these seven (7) months we waited the directive from the environment minister to see the results of the impact study that was presented in two thousand six (2006), February.

And before going into it further, we consulted again the population on the twenty-nine (29) of October, two thousand five (2005) before the election to ask them their opinion on the progress of the impact study, and I was present at that. And Mme Journault and Mr. Labrie, it was just to give you an idea of the chronology. The site was known, the capacity of the site was known as of March two thousand five (2005).
2360

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2365 (Translation) We had two (2) questions regarding the claims. Does it go with the zone that is going to have the LET?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2370 Excuse me, Mrs. Chair, but I will check when I arrive in my room for the exact place of the site. I saw it at a distance, but I will look, if you allow me to have a copy of that map or if you send it to me by e-mail.

2375 But what I know in terms of my checking with the Natural Resources, the claims have no impact on the realization or not of this site. There are claims everywhere and Natural Resources Department told us it was not a problem. But I will check where those places are. Even if there are claims every two (2) months with a site it wouldn't have a bearing.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And would it be possible to write a small note to explain the map that you presented? Because we have the residences that are within a radius of two (2) miles.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) And the farming zone as well?

2390 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Yes, there was a request that asked where there were some agricultural zones within that two kilometres. Not the zoning, but where there are agricultural land right now.

2395 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) You know that I have also given the graphic matrix and all the land titles of the RCM. And so the list, Mr. Roberge could show it to you, but we're going to describe in a small document and add the agricultural zone on that map as well, with pleasure.

2400

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Ota Hora.

2405 MR. OTA HORA:

(Translation) Good evening, Mrs. Chair, Mr. Commissioner and everyone here. My name is Ota Hora. I am the pro-mayor of Kazabazua and I am going to speak here in that capacity. (End of translation)

2410

I would like to correct several inaccuracies in the Mayor of Bryson's presentation. One was previously mentioned, where he based... one of his statements he indicated that the eighteen (18) mayors of the MRC Pontiac worked together and respect all communities. He felt very comfortable in his support of the Danford proposal because, as he said, the majority of permanent residents support it. That is inaccurate. That is hearsay.

2415

And as we all know, anybody that's been involved in surveys, when you stick something in front of somebody, very often people sign anything. It's been known that children have been signed, signatures have been formed. That's why the... certainly in our municipality we're strongly in favour of referendums if anything that controversial ever comes forward.

2420

Also I would like it corrected in the record that the Yes Committee made the same error in terms of their factual statement that a survey is factual, and it's not factual.

2425

Also at the end of the Mayor of Bryson's presentation he indicated that he felt very comfortable with this proposal for Danford village because, as he stated, the majority of people in the MRC Pontiac support this proposal. That is inaccurate. I have talked to a number of mayors when they did their initial vote in terms of this proposal, they had not had full time to consult their constituents. I have talked to constituents that have not been consulted. And I

2430 would like that noted in the record.

Finally, the MRC Pontiac's presentation, one of the key statements was that they took into consideration, they were very concerned over transportation distances, and they had that table with how far it is to Lachute. Originally the Danford site was not on their proposals, it
2435 came up in the last minute. And if you look at the map, Danford village is at the far end of their MRC.

I just talked to a mayor that is at the other extreme of the MRC and he has to truck his stuff a considerable distance to get to Danford village. And just in Otter Lake here there's an
2440 extra thirty-five (35) kilometres put on to trucking of all the garbage from the MRC Pontiac to go to Danford. Danford village is inappropriately situated for somebody to say that this is an advantageous transportation position.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:
2445

(Translation) It's not a rectification.

MR. OTA HORA:

2450 (Translation) Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Are there any other people? Mr. Renato Livinal. You took your name
2455 out? Oh. You're the last person, I hope.

MR. RENATO LIVINAL:

Mrs. President and Mr. Commissioner, three (3) points by Mme Latimer. First of all, I'm
2460 confused in terms of the dollars per ton. First, there were talked about two dollars (\$2.00). She submitted four dollars (\$4.00), so I am perplexed as to the actual figures that keep on jumping up and down. And also the number of tonnage. Those are all estimates.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:
2465

(Translation) I can give you the answer. What we understood, because I saw two dollars (\$2.00) and four dollars (\$4.00) also. They take into consideration the fact that it will be two dollars (\$2.00) for the Municipality for Alleyn and Cawood and two dollars (\$2.00) which is being negotiated in the RCM of Pontiac.

2470

MR. RENATO LIVINAL:

2475 Fine. The next point is the number of employment opportunities. We started off with thirty (30) and now we're down to four (4) as based on what the publication on the government was. From four (4) they were up to six (6). Tonight we heard about ten (10), twelve (12). So again, I'm very confused.

2480 The third point, Mme la présidente, and this is a key point to me as a taxpayer of Danford Lake, there is a distinction between a full-time resident of Danford Lake and a taxpayer or, as we are referred to, as the "outsiders". So there's a distinction and discrimination in between the two (2) parties.

2485 I have never received any notices of elections and/or the statement of this proposed mega dump that was sent to me. Now, in this day and age two thousand and seven (2007) you have e-mails, you have regular mail, but we never got any of this stuff. So I'm contesting this fact. What I would like The Commission to check out is to ask the municipality to show proof that indeed all of the full-time residents and the taxpayer, if we're entitled to it, I don't know at this point anymore, to actually participate in this consultation process. And to show proof that it can actually have done that.

2490 So we can eliminate one side of the people saying, "Oh yes, we've been all notified and told about it." And then you've got people like me which have been paying taxes for over thirty (30) years, excuse me, I correct that, twenty-seven (27) years at Danford, okay, which have never received any notices. So I'd like this point to be clarified and I think we... you have the tools to do that by asking the municipality to actually show proof that indeed through receipts of cost or post office receipts showing where these letters, these notices have actually been sent. Thank you very much.

2500 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you. It is eleven o'clock (11:00), I think it is. So we've managed to do it within the time limit. I congratulate you. So we'll see you tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock (2:00).

2505 I, Annagret Rinaldi, the undersigned, Official Court Reporter, do hereby certify, under my oath of office, that the foregoing is a true transcription of the above-named speakers at the public hearings conducted by the BAPE.

2510 AND I HAVE SIGNED:

ANNAGRET RINALDI,
Official Court Reporter.