

**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**

FIRST PHASE

VOLUME 3

Hearing held May 16, 2007, 19 h
Centre de ski Mont Sainte-Marie
160, chemin de la Montagne
Lac Sainte-Marie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PERIOD :

PAUL DINGLEDINE	3
RAY THOMAS	11
NICOLE DESROCHERS.....	25
GILLES PELLETIER.....	28
KAREEN LITTLE	34
MICHEL TURCOT	36
MARY MASOTTI	36
RECESS.....	38
JEAN-MARC BOUCHER	38
PAUL DINGLEDINE	44
MICHEL TURCOT	46
MICHÈLE BORCHERS	52
STACY MOLYNEAUX.....	53
ANDRÉ CARRIÈRE	56
RENATO LIVINAL	65
SHANNON MARTIN.....	66
ROBERT WILLS.....	70
PRISCILLA LATIMER.....	73
GILLES PELLETIER.....	77
SCOTT MOLYNEAUX.....	84

MS. CLAUDETTE JOURNAULT,
THE CHAIRWOMAN:

5 Welcome to this third session. The register is still open. To ask your questions, you must first register. You're allowed one question per intervener. And I would ask you to only ask one question and to re-register if required, because a lot of people are still unregistered and haven't had an opportunity to ask their question.

10 We'll ask the proponent to introduce himself and explain who is accompanying him and if he has any experts that are here to answer your questions.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

15 Thank you, madame Chairperson. My name is Denis Rouleau. I am the CEO of LDC Gestion services environnementaux. And to my right André Poulin, engineer and technical advisor and project manager of Teknika HBA, He's accompanied by his team of specialists Yves Gagnon, engineer, Patrice Bigras, geographer, Patrick Gagnon, engineer, Marc Drouin, engineer, Jean-François Mouton, forest engineer, Jacques Boilard, acoustical engineer or sound engineer
20 and André Guibord, communication specialist. And we have Jacques BOILARD who is the sound engineer with us, madame Chairperson.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

25 And resource persons?

MS. KIM CARTIER-VILLENEUVE:

30 Kim Cartier-Villeneuve, representative of the municipality Alley-et-Cawood.

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

Pierre Ricard, director general of municipal affairs and region.

35 MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

Patrick Autotte, natural resources and fauna.

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

40 Jacques Nadeau, city of Gatineau.

MS. DANIÈLE MEILLEUR:

45 Danièle Meilleur, public security ministry of Quebec.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

50 There are other resource persons in the room, please stand and introduce yourselves.
You'll have to go to a mike to do so, please.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

55 Pierre Duchesne, Pontiac MRC.

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTÉ:

Patrick Laliberté, MRC of Collines-de-l'Outaouais.

60 MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

Catherine Lussier, Gatineau Valley MRC.

MR. LEON MARTIN:

65 The Director general of Environmental Surveillance, Outaouais region will come tomorrow.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

70 Is that all? Public Safety Ministry? You've introduced yourself, pardon me. Thank you,
I'd like to remind you that Mr. Joseph Squitti, the mayor, will be able to answer the Commission's
questions over the phone at 7:30. This afternoon, we invited you to write your questions down
because the Mayor is not capable of coming for health reasons, but he will be over the phone. If
you have any questions, please write them down and hand them over to the secretariat with your
75 name, please.

Are there any documents to file or unanswered questions to which you want to bring
clarifications. On the Proponent's side for tonight?

80 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

Yes, madame Chairperson, however, given that we've been told that the Transport
Ministry will come tomorrow afternoon in Gatineau, we have clarifications to bring, a

supplemental brief, with regard to truck transportation.

85

However, we would like to hear the comments of the Ministry, the Transport Ministry, before completing the information as mentioned this afternoon. We have our sound specialist, however, for those people who would like to know more about the impact of the noise surrounding the project.

90

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Do you have a brief presentation to make on the impact of the noise, with regard to noise?

95

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

I have no other documents than those that were introduced earlier. However, we do have a Power Point presentation. The ones that have already been filed, yes. So we can reproduce them on the screens behind us. But it would be easier for Mr. Boilard to simply answer questions.

100

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Very well. Do people in the room have questions with regard to the impact of noise? Please raise your hand if you do, if you have a question on noise. So we'll hear your questions before the registered people, could you please hand your name over to the people at the secretariat.

105

For those people who have questions with regard to the impact of noise, the impact of noise because of the project. Now, please give your name to the secretariat and we will hear your questions following that. There are two (2) people I believe? It's not too late, you can still register. Mr. Paul Dingleline.

110

MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm sorry, the noise question wasn't on my agenda tonight so... I would like to, we have - all the members of the coalition have been through the parts of the environmental studies that dealt with noise created by trucks and by the site itself.

115

My question relates to the noise on the trucks. The people who did the studies selected six (6) places, one is Kazabazua, one north of Kazabazua, one between Kazabazua and Danford Lake, one in Danford Lake and two (2) to the west of the site.

120

125 My question relates really to the choice of those sites. All those sites are on level ground where the trucks are travelling at a steady pace. They're not accelerating, they're not decelerating, they're not turning the corner.

And I think the first sort of part of the question is obviously trucks make more noise when they're going up and down a hill, which they do a lot between Wakefield and Kazabazua.

130 Why were all the sites, like or when they're turning a corner, when they come to Kazabazua, you know, you've been there, they have to slow down, they have to idle, wait at the corner to turn on the 301. Then they have to accelerate once they turn.

135 So it seems to us that the sites were chosen, were deliberately chosen to provide the minimum amount of noise from the passing trucks.

140 And the second part of the question is on the choice of sites. Why did they chose those kinds of sites and ignore the real serious part of the noise, which is from Wakefield to Kazabazua where there are hills and curves. And where the houses are quite close to the road?

145 And the third part of that question, again on why did they chose to measure from fifteen (15) metres when so many of the houses, fifty (50), sixty (60), seventy (70) houses between Wakefield and Kazabazua are far closer to the road than fifty (50) feet?

150 So really, the first two questions on the choice of sites, why all level ground, why not in corners or hills where they're turning? And the second part of the question is why did they decide to measure from fifteen (15) feet when so many people - fifteen (15) metres, when so many people live inside that circle?

150 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Mr. Rouleau?

155 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

Mr. Boilard will answer your question.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

160 Madam Chairperson, to answer the first part of the question, the four (4) sites that were chosen to measure noise, were chosen to calibrate a model that would be used to evaluate the noise impact of the project.

In this type of situation, what we do is that we don't chose a corner because there would

165 be factors that wouldn't allow for proper calibration. So we choose sites that allow for proper calibration. And following that with the model, we can measure the impact of the project.

170 The second part of the question, could you remind me actually what it was? We chose fifteen (15) metres because that distance seems to be the average distance between the residences and the road. We did measure the impact in different circumstances however. We evaluated fifteen (15) metres, twenty-five (25), fifty (50), a hundred (100) metres from the road.

So thanks to this model, we can then evaluate the audio impact in different areas.

175 MR. DONALD LABRIE,
THE COMMISSIONER:

180 Mr. Boilard, you say that you used straight parts of the road to calibrate your model, but when new trucks get on the road, is there not further impact? What would have been your conclusion if you'd measured in an area where there were more corners or more hills?

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

185 We conducted the exercise on a hill and the impact would have been lower. The impact would have been lower if we'd chosen a site where there were hills. The worst case scenario is the flat surface.

190 You shouldn't lose sight of the fact - actually, to explain if my current traffic level is higher than the number of trucks that will be add-ons, truck level will increase, so on the whole, the impact is lessened in a hill.

THE COMMISSIONER:

195 Well, that's not clear to me.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

200 One truck produces noise as it goes up a hill. So I measure the noise that is generated by additional trucks. If I'm on a flat surface...

THE COMMISSIONER:

How is the audio impact higher?

205 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

The hill has the main impact on all trucks, so if I have more trucks at the outset, which is

210 the case in this project, the current truck traffic is higher than the number of trucks that will be added by the project. So if I have a hill, truck noise will be higher and what will be added on will also be higher. But the difference between the two will mean that the impact is lower if I'm in a hill than if I'm on a flat surface.

THE COMMISSIONER:

215 Because the noise level is higher?

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

220 Yes, because the noise level at the outset is higher, so the difference between the two, the variants between the two is lower.

THE COMMISSIONER:

225 But if I double the number of trucks, the variance is the same whether I'm on a flat surface or on a hill.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

230 Correct, if you double... it's hard to answer your question, really.

THE COMMISSIONER:

235 I see things in a different way, I mean the trucks are going up the hill and I double the number of trucks going up that hill, the noise level is higher. Whether I'm on a flat surface or going up a hill, the noise level is the same.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

240 Yes, three (3) DBs the variance.

THE COMMISSIONER:

245 So it has no impact in your opinion, whether you're on a hill, turning a corner, or on a flat surface.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

Not in that situation.

250 THE COMMISSIONER:

The variance is the same.

255 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

But in this project, since there are more trucks, when there are hills, according to our model, the noise is lessened.

260 THE COMMISSIONER:

And what about the fact that you're measuring the noise level of fifteen (15) metres, if the distance were shorter, the noise would be higher. What would be the impact if you measured closer to the road rather than fifteen (15) metres away?

265 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

This is a linear source. A road is a linear source of noise. So if you add trucks, whether you're at ten (10) metres, fifteen (15), twenty (20), twenty-five (25) metres, the impact will be pretty much the same. As I said earlier, we measured at different distances. We checked at
270 twenty-five (25), fifty (50), a hundred (100) metres, a hundred fifty (150) metres, and the variance of the impact was a few tenths of a decibel.

So what applies to fifteen (15) metres can apply to ten (10) metres or twenty-five (25). Normally, it's quite similar, because the mitigation of sound is the same for all vehicles on the
275 road. Does this answer your question?

MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

It is some of it counter intuitive, but I think from the perspective of, you know, you're
280 looking at noise by truck A and noise by truck B, I mean it might make sense. But it doesn't make any sense at all when you're looking at absolute levels of noise.

And it's interesting that in the... elsewhere in the study, the study, the people who did the study, made much of the fact that they always took worst case scenarios. But here, they say no,
285 no, fifteen (15) metres because that was the average.

There are a lot of houses. A lot of people live under fifteen (15) metres from the centre of that road. And the amount of noise they get, you know, frankly, I mean they can say it's three (3) decibels, and my colleague in a moment will deal with this, but they can say it's a three (3) decibel
290 increase but the fact is that one truck makes this amount of noise, two trucks makes two

times this amount of noise.

And so, where you are relevant to this truck, how close you are to the truck is very relevant to what is the impact on the people.

295

THE COMMISSIONER:

What we understand is that what they measured through the study is the noise that would be generated by the additional trucks whether you're on a corner or on a linear stretch, the noise variation is the same.

300

Obviously, closer to the road, the noise is higher, but the variance is the same whether you're at a corner or whether you're on a stretch. That's what Mr. Boilard explained.

305

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Right, moving on. Parks and natural resources, when the Transport Ministry designed the road, it evaluates the increase in DBAs, alpha decibels, to see if it's inferior or superior to three (3) units of increase. But that's not the only parameter, there's also the starting parameter which is ambient noise. And when ambient noise reaches a certain level, it cannot be increased. It think it's sixty-five (65) ADBs, alpha decibels, without generating significant impact.

310

Could you clarify that? I'm sure you have information in that regard.

315

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

I'm sorry, Madam Chairperson, yes, the Environment Ministry does not have one special way of measuring this. On the whole, we use the Transport Ministry's evaluation system which is what our consultants did. To answer your question, depending on the ambient noise, if you start at forty-five (45) ADBs, to reach the sixty-five (65) ADB levels, you'll need a lot more noise than if you started at sixty-four (64). That's common sense.

320

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Now in this present case, are there areas where we could reach the maximum level of sixty-five (65)? In the hills for example, or the curves or the corners. Are there areas where you'd reach sixty-five (65)?

325

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

330

I can give you the results of what we measured on the ground.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

335 I would remind the public that if you have any questions for Mr. Squitti, please give them to the secretariat and they will be raised in seven (7) minutes.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

340 To answer your question, the noise levels varied between fifty-nine point five (59.5) and sixty-nine point nine (69.9) alpha decibels. So in some areas, yes, we were higher than sixty-five (65). I could answer your question with regard to the Transport Ministry.

345 The Transport Ministry has an integrated planning approach. And also a corrective measures approach. And the integrated planning applies to new projects. And in this case, they aim for sixty-five (65) ADB for a new road. But for existing roads, there are rules to follow. There has to be a minimum number of houses that are exposed to higher than sixty-five (65) ADB over twenty-four (24) hours. There has to be a certain density of houses, higher than certain criteria.

350 So, there has to be quite a few perimeters present before the Ministry intervenes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

355 My question did not deal with the intervention of the Transport Ministry. I was addressing the noise level that becomes problematic.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

360 And it's sixty-five (65) ADB.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

And in this case, there will be areas where you'll be over sixty-five (65).

365 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

370 We did not measure over twenty-four (24) hours. But we did have fifty-nine point nine (59.9) during a one hour time frame. During the night normally, the noise levels should be much lower. So we would have to have an average over twenty-four (24) hours to determine if the Ministry would have to intervene.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Leaving aside the question of the Ministry intervening, what about the citizens, the

375 residents themselves, have they already reached the limit that should not be exceeded?

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

Well, obviously it's quite high, sixty-five (65) ADB is a high noise level.

380

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Supplemental?

385

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

I was saying that the sixty-nine (69) decibels is before the add on of new trucks.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

390

I understand that. It's already very high, so we have to be careful not to add any more noise. And there are already situations like that. Did I understand the Ministry's policy?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

395

Yes, Madam Chairperson, you understood correctly. But I would add is that the results that were given to us by the proponent, and since we consulted the Transport Ministry, there is a correction of two point six (2.6) DBAs that has to be taken into account.

400

But where they reached sixty-nine point nine (69.9), is this over a one (1) hour period?

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

405

Yes, one (1) hour. If we'd had a longer time frame, it would have been lower because we would have had the night time that reduces the noise level substantially.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

410

That's what the Transport Ministry said as well. You have to consider the evaluation over twenty-four (24) hours, whereas the proponent's study is based on a ten (10) hour time frame. The ten (10) hours during which traffic will happen. So there was a correction that was brought by the Transport Ministry.

415

But on the whole, the proponent did follow the procedures. Our specialists and the Transport Ministry specialists did come to the conclusion that the impact should be minimal.

MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

420 Quickly, the question you raised, Madam Chairman, about sixty-nine (69) decibels, remember that was sixty-nine (69) decibels worth fifteen (15) metres. At ten (10) metres, I'm not sure of the equation, but it would be many, many times higher than that. So you're already... if you're exceeding at sixty-nine (69), you are way exceeding at ten (10) metres from the centre of the road.

425 And second point before I leave, the whole question of presenting the data in this way as an averaged over a period of time, we think is very misleading. But my colleague, when you call my colleague, he will address that issue.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

430 Thank you. In a few minutes, we will be establishing a contact on the phone. Are there any other people who are registered? Mr. Thomas, we'll hear your question.

MR. RAY THOMAS:

435 My name is Dr. Ray Thomas, I'm an electrical engineer. And I'm familiar with noise. So, I'd like to make a couple of comments first. The average noise, ambient noise level was taken in the report, as I believe, was thirty-five (35) DB. It's very clear that a lot of people don't understand decibels. A lot of engineers don't understand decibels.

440 You have to remember it's a log riddling factor, so that if we have a ten (10) DB increase in noise, we actually have a doubling of the actual noise effect. And if we go from the thirty-five (35) DB to a seventy-five (75) DB level, which is appropriate for many large trucks, diesel trucks, then you are talking at least at sixteen (16) times increase in the noise level.

445 My question is more related to how they reach this three (3) DB average increase, because to me, that is not the way to present noise, the effect on people. We should talk about noise annoyance. And the noise annoyance is - we have a fairly standard noise level and then, all of a sudden, something interferes with that noise level and brings the noise level up much higher.

450 And that is what happens when a truck come along. You'll hear the truck coming along. It'll come to the point close to you, which is equivalent to what they're measuring. And at that point, the noise will then fall off. You have the maximum at that point.

455 And noise falls off as the square root of distance, sorry, as an inverse square of distance. So, we have a time dwelling of that noise. And as you go to the intersection between

at Kazabazua, between 105 and 301, you're going to have trucks coming along, slowing down, stopping, waiting for oncoming traffic to go by, and then turn the corner and ramp up. So you've got a long dwelling period of noise.

460

My question then is has this group actually taken into account this noise annoyance factor? Have a hundred and twenty-two (122) times a day, that they were going to - extra, that we're going to see this noise annoyance factor coming into play.

465

So how did they arrive at this three (3) DB level, average level is the question. And to my mind, that is totally inappropriate to the effect on the people that are encountering that noise.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

470

The parameter that's used in the noise impact studies is the equivalent to the level of noise, which is an averaging of all the points of noise that there can be over a certain period. It's the parameter that needs to be used to have comparables, that will be easy to compare.

475

So the three (3) DBs, what that represents is a relevant increase of that index in a present situation, a future situation with the project in operation. That's the method that's used for sound impact or audio impact.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

480

From the Ministry of Sustainable Development, the impact, this is comparable in terms of the sound effect. The Ministry of Transport told us in recent hearings that it was about to review its policies on noise. And was to work with other ministries to update its policy in this regard. And there are also the European approaches, could you talk about that somewhat?

485

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

490

Yes, Madam Chair, I know that the Ministry of Transport is in the process of re-evaluating its way of determining. And it's a matter of knowing when they intervene as well. Because the questioning in some public hearing commissions, we didn't agree with the Commission that determines impacts on noise in terms of the methodology. This is the same methodology that's used by everyone.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

495

If we come back to the moment when they are to intervene, there are other things beside simply the three (3) DBAs that come into play. There is also a sort of absolute limit where, after a certain level, it becomes more of a problem to live close to it.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

500

I think that it's much more a way of adapting to what you just said, Madam Chair, to what is being done elsewhere. So, some international health organizations and other organizations have attempted to evaluate noise. And especially the impact of noise.

505

And it seemed to be easy but it was rather a question of how to evaluate the impact on the public that had to put up with that noise. So that's the contradiction that we're looking at in order to adapt to what is being done elsewhere in the world in this area.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

510

Thank you.

MR. RAY THOMAS:

515

I would conclude that the three (3) DB does not give the true picture of the impact on people. It's more disruption of what they're used to, what are they used to hearing. And so the impact of adding seventy-five percent (75%) more trucks, seventy-five percent (75%) more times when the noise rises well above the ambient, that's a more severe impact than indicated by the three (3) DB average.

520

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

So, I will invite you to put that in your brief. There is another person registered regarding this question, but we'll continue with it after our discussion with Mayor Joseph Squitti. Do we have the Mayor on the phone? It won't be long.

525

As soon as Mr. Squitti is on the line.

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

530

Hello.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Yes, good evening. Yes, can you hear us?

535

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Yes, I can hear you.

540

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Very well, we have a number of questions for you.

545 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

550

The first one from Mr. Gilles Pelletier. Mr. Mayor, it's the whole question of the referendum. Why, first of all, did you tell the public that there would be a referendum when the question was asked to the board. And following that, at a council, you used your veto to reject that citizens' proposal?

555

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Look, I don't ever recall saying that there would be a referendum, and why I vetoed that vote is because all of the members of council weren't there to vote on it. We had had repeated requests for a referendum. And I believe probably there was - I don't have any documentation here with me at home, but I believe that it was voted on twice and it was voted down.

560

A referendum would have been non binding as it would have been consultive only. That's my answer.

565

THE COMMISSIONER:

I have a question for you in English, I'll read it in English, Mr. Mayor.

570

"On at least two (2) occasions, you have indicated that if the LET is not approved, the annual cost of disposing the village's garbage and monitoring the current trench dump will cost one hundred thousand (100 000 \$) to one hundred twenty-five thousand (125 000 \$) a year.

Could you tell us how you arrive at this figure?"

575

The question is from Mary Masotti.

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

580

Okay, I don't fully understand what the question was, but I know that as a municipality, in order by 2008, that we cannot use our trench landfill site. So that means that we'll have to transport, we'll have to collect and transport waste and take it somewhere.

585 So the cost that you're talking about was an estimate because the council hasn't sat down yet and got prices on that. We are just averaging out costs for recycling and to get rid of the waste.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

590 Mr. Mayor, Claudette Journault, a question from Mr. Gilles Pelletier. He asks why was there a vote on accepting the technical site in October, 2005, the first day of the deer hunting season? Why was it that day on which the vote was held?

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

595 Because that's when we decided to have it, not everybody is a hunter. Not everybody is a fisherman. So when do you have it? That's just when we decided to have it. It had nothing to do with because it was the first day of hunting.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

600 Were all citizens able to participate in that - were all citizens able to vote upon accepting, people who are property owners, taxpayers or simply permanent residents?

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

605 Everybody could attend the - could attend the public consultations. Every taxpayer was sent out a notice for that, I believe. Like I said, I don't have all my paperwork here, but I recall that. Like the public consultations were open to everybody. And not only people from the community but people from outside of the community. Anybody who was interested in attending.

610

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

615 At that time, was the project of about the same scope as the one we're looking at this week with the citizens?

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

620 That's how it was, that's how it was presented. I'm sure, I'm sure it's the same size because we have a the book up in the library, the municipal hall, and it was up there for everybody to view.

THE COMMISSIONER:

One more question from Mary Masotti, Mr. Mayor.

625

"As any landfill project have a host community agreement, by what authority did you sign one on behalf of the community?"

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

630

I have, prior to maybe two (2) months ago, nothing was ever signed by the mayor. And what we signed was a letter of intent to get two dollars (2 \$) per ton for the waste that was brought to the landfill site.

635

THE COMMISSIONER:

Did you have any verbal agreement with the promoter?

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

640

A verbal agreement was, for the study, this was brought up by council and I'm sure that there's a resolution from council. It's not that the Mayor did this on his own.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

645

A question from Michèle Borchers, I believe, Madame Michèle Borchers I believe.

650

"A letter inviting citizens to the first meeting on October 16th, 2004, and this letter only spoke about the need to replace the old site with a technical landfill site without stipulating that this new depot would have approximately one thousand times the size of the old depot and site, and would serve the whole Outaouais region.

Why in that letter of invitation, details concerning the scope of the project were not given?"

655

MR. JOSPEH SQUITTI:

Now because the details of the scope were given at the public consultation.

THE COMMISSIONER:

660

A question from Ken Molyneaux.

"Were you or any councillors asked to hold a referendum on the landfill?"

665 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Well, as a council we were asked, yes.

670 THE COMMISSIONER:

Did anyone or person offer to pay for a referendum?

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

675 I believe that we checked that with the lawyer and you can't do that.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

680 Another question from Madame Michèle Borchers? I believe it's Mrs. Michèle Borchers or Ms.

"The council decided to officially approve the project only two (2) weeks after that first meeting or three (3) I believe. Why did the council deliberately give in to the promoter after only one (1) meeting at which only fourteen (14) residents were present? Why that haste?"

685 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

690 First off, it wasn't in haste, having fourteen (14) people at a meeting is usually four (4) or five (5) times more than we ever have, have at a meeting. We used to generally have two (2) or three (3) people.

There was nothing done in haste. It's a small community. Word travels fast in the community. The council wasn't hiding anything from anybody and the council wanted to see the environmental impact study.

695 THE COMMISSIONER:

A question addressed to you but I'm not sure that you're the right person, but I'll read it, from Scott Molyneaux.

700 *"Can you please open the gate to access the public land? I would like to visit the site?"*

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

705 Can I? Well, I'm sure that the promoter would do that. Council, as far as I know, I don't have a key for that. The director general may, if not, it would have to go through the promoter.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

710 We'll take advantage of this opportunity to end on this question. Are you offering visits to this site or the surveillance committee, can the members of the surveillance committee accompany citizens who would like to visit the site.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

715 I've had a few requests in that regard, but when we did receive them, we took people ourselves to see the site, but if there are requests, we can organize a visit, yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

720 He should then communicate with you or with the municipality? Who should he...

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

725 With myself or the municipality, it doesn't matter. The municipality can reach me if he gets in touch with them. On the other hand, we are not owners of that site. The Ministry of Natural Resources would have to give its consent.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

730 But you would make contact?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

735 Yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

740 Thank you. Another question which also comes from Ms. Michèle Borchers.

745 *"In a letter dated October 2005 to taxpayers, the Mayor justifies his decision of having supported the project by saying that he obtained the general consensus among the fourteen (14) residents who were at the first public meeting on the date of October 16th, 2004, which suggests that there was not even unanimity among the fourteen (14) residents present.*

The question then is with the exception of the Mayor and the six (6) councillors, as well as the three (3) or four (4) municipal employees, how many taxpayers of Alayn-et-Cawood were at the consultation, do you remember?"

750 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

No, no, I don't, I don't have that with me and what that was for was to go ahead, I mean, I'm trying to recollect this. I was to go ahead with the environmental impact study. It was an approval. Council never gave any formal approval for this, it was to go ahead with the environmental impact study. To take it that one more step. The BAPE hearing is for this process now.

As the municipality council looked at, we have to - we have to become self-sustainable. This would provide that opportunity. Is it going to - and in what ways is it going to affect the culture, the environment, the heritage, et cetera? That's why you have an environmental impact study. That was what we wanted to see.

760 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

765 Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER:

You were always referring to the BAPE hearings when questioned or asked the municipal council meetings all through 2000 regarding the proposed mega dumps. What was behind the Mayor's refusal to enter into any real dialogue with taxpayers of Allevyn-et-Cawood to hear the concern about any aspects of the dump issue?

775 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

The coalition was at every meeting for over a year. The coalition met with the council at least on one (1) occasion. Personally, as the Mayor, I met with two (2) members of the coalition at separate times. There was never any - any idea or anything to stop correspondence or questions from the coalition.

780 THE COMMISSIONER:

What did you mean when you did answer to the citizens that you will have your note at the BAPE hearings, what did you mean by that?

785 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Well, that's when anybody can stand up at the BAPE hearing. And I believe that's June 12th, to give their opinion. You know, what were they - what were they going to talk about? What like the coalition had said? What the promoter had said?

790

795 The environmental impact study hadn't been out yet. What's a lie and what is the truth? How do you know? There was no study done yet. So, anyone from the community has the opportunity now to ask questions, to get the questions to their answers and then - and then to state their opinion on the 12th of June. That's how the process is set up. You know, you have questions, get the answers.

THE COMMISSIONER:

800 The question was from Linda Cronk.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

805 Mr. Mayor, a question which comes from Ms. Michèle Borchers, the second question that I have.

810 *"What legal precept does the municipality base itself to determine there was a consensus among the fourteen (14) taxpayers out of more than a hundred (100)? On what basis did you decide that that was sufficient to follow up on the project?"*

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

815 For all that we followed up on, was to get an environmental impact study. You know with fourteen (14), fourteen (14) out of a hundred (100), what does - or a hundred and six (106), what is the percentage off the top of my head now? I don't know. The invitation was put out to everyone just like it is when you have a council meeting.

820 Like I said, at council meetings we usually get two (2) or three (3) people. Here we have fourteen (14), it's five (5) or six (6) times. What do we do? We have to keep moving.

THE COMMISSIONER:

825 A last question but one that might better be addressed to Mr. Rouleau. Why was the site locked if it's a public site?

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Why is the site locked? Well, it's not owned by the municipality.

830 THE COMMISSIONER:

Do you have anything to add, Mr. Rouleau?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU

835

Yes, Mr. Commissioner. The property that gives access to this property is private property and that's why - and it's through an agreement with the people from whom we bought the property that we set up this locked access.

840

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

We will continue with the questions. The second public meeting was held March 12th, 2005. This time, taxpayers were invited only through a poster placed at strategic places in the municipality.

845

This second municipality gave the municipality and the promoter an opportunity to rectify the situation. Unfortunately, they missed the boat by holding it in mid-winter, whereas the majority of taxpayers hadn't reopened the secondary residences. And in informing residents through only a poster didn't work out.

850

Only six (6), I believe, people participated at this meeting. Question: Why did you choose to have a second public information session in the mid-winter when the majority of taxpayers are absent?

855

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Well, I guess if it's really important to people, like it doesn't matter, not every cottager comes up in the summer. Some of the cottagers come up in the winter to ski and enjoy the winter. There never is a perfect time.

860

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Could this type of meeting have - could we have sent a written notice to all taxpayers about this second meeting?

865

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Well, I guess anything could have been done.

870

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Are there rules that require that all taxpayers be advised of this type of meeting?

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

875

Everything that we did with having to do with this project was consulted through our

lawyer and municipal affairs. Everything was done the way it was supposed to have been done.

THE COMMISSIONER:

880

Given the project's impact, why were the three (3) public meetings held at times when you could reasonably expect that most taxpayers would be absent and so there would therefore be a minimal level of participation?

885

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

890

Well, that's just somebody's point of view. It's not the point of view from council. Like I said, there never, never is a good time. Somebody always has something to do. There's always something now going on. So when, you can't please and find the time for everybody no matter what you do.

If you have it on Christmas, why didn't you have it on Boxing Day. You have it on Boxing Day, why didn't... like it's endless.

895

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

900

There is a question which is more or less the same as the one that was asked just a little earlier. What method of calculation was used by the Mayor to establish that a consensus was obtained with fourteen (14) taxpayers out of over a hundred (100) for the entire community? And this is in referring to the 1st of December edition of the Pontiac newspaper, that is only six (6) weeks after the first public meeting. Whereas the Mayor had declared the he had the support of his community with fourteen (14) taxpayers present.

905

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

Right, and like I said that's five (5) or six (6) or seven (7) than times that we ever, ever had at a meeting. And it wasn't to sign anything, it was just to carry on with the environmental impact study so questions could be answered.

910

THE COMMISSIONER:

This time Mr. Mayor, this is a question from the Commission. In your opinion, how was the landfill site accepted by the population, is it well received within your municipality?

915

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

By the population in the community, I believe it's generally accepted. For various reasons, it's costing more all the time to run a municipality. We are constantly being

920 downloaded from the Provincial Government like for policing, fire protection. Now it's recycling,
it's waste.

925 We have to become self-sustainable and people believe that this project won't even - won't
even be noticed because of where it is. It'll have very little, if any, impact on the community. My
concern, as a mayor, had to do with transportation. Logging trucks are constantly going through
the village, so it's not like anything new is being introduced to the municipality.

930 And in fact, the number of logging trucks, I believe and I don't have any stats on this, I
just know that lots of mills have closed, that there's fewer logging trucks going through. I hope that
answers your question.

930 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

935 Another question, Mr. Mayor, also from Ms. Michèle Borchers with regard to the fact that
when the municipality of Alleyn-et-Cawood gave the green light to the project on November 1st,
2004 by adopting the resolutions to allow LDC to go through with the project, the city planning
regulations did not allow for a TLS on site. It had to modify its regulations or by-laws in
accordance.

940 In 2006, in November, the Ministry of municipal affairs and regions, and the municipality
of Alleyn-et-Cawood organized a public assembly for consultation on the proposed changes to the
zoning and by-laws of Alleyn-et-Cawood. More than three hundred (300) people took part in the
townhall meeting in the presence of the municipal affairs Ministry.

945 The taxpayers are told by the city planners of the municipality that if enough people, with
the right to vote, signed the register, there would be a referendum open to all taxpayers of the
municipality. Alleyn-et-Cawood's population then hoped to be its own... or plan its own destiny.

950 The question now, the rest of the information has already been given, so the question is a
democratic consultation process on de-zoning had been started. And a great number of citizens
had sent letters with regard to the zoning proposals. And hundreds of them expected a
referendum on the question.

Why did you stop that democratic process?

955 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

The answer to that is because we decided to conform to the MRC by-laws and rules and
regulations. We had our whole plan changed to follow that. There was one line in our plan where -
I mean I'm just trying to recall this, where we thought perhaps that it may be a good idea,

960 I can't remember right now exactly how that was worded. But we decided to be in conformity with the regional council.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

965 And during the meeting with the MRC, did you mention that there was significant opposition in your community, since there was a meeting where there were three hundred (300) people present, about three (300) people who expressed or voiced their concerns with regard to the project. Did you relay this information to the other members of the MRC?

970 MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

There was a petition I believe. Well, the coalition had spoken many times at the MRC. And there was a petition, I believe, presented at the MRC with the names of a hundred (100) plus residents of the community who supported the project.

975

THE COMMISSIONER:

From Mr. Ray Thomas:

980 *"What effect will the dramatic increase in taxes in Alleyn-et-Cawood this year have on the necessity for money from such a project as the landfill?"*

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

985 This year, we were fortunate because we had an increase in revenues, that we didn't have to raise taxes. A ratepayers taxes only went up if their evaluation was changed. But, like I said, we're going to have to get some prices to find what it's going to cost to pick up and ship the waste from the municipality to wherever it's going to go if this project does not happen.

990 We are a small municipality population wise, but large land wise. So we have a long way to go to collect garbage. So right now, I couldn't tell you the increase in taxes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

995 One last question, are there any other questions that have been handed to the secretariat? No, indicates the secretariat, this is the last question. And it's from Gilles Pelletier. Why, during the municipal council meetings during the past few months, did you leave the council without adjourning the meeting and without answering the citizens' questions relative... I suppose this is with regard to the technical landfill site?

1000

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

1005 Okay, every meeting that I have, I've been at, there is a question period at the end of the meeting. And I have to adjourn a meeting. And it's adjourned and it's proposed by a councillor and it's seconded. You just can't get up and walk away.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1010 Thank you very much, your Worship. The questions that were received by the Commission have all been asked or have been briefly presented to relay the questions. Thank you, your Worship.

MR. JOSEPH SQUITTI:

1015 My health doesn't allow that right now, at this time. And I'm very, very sorry because I've been through this whole process and I would love nothing more than to be there. Thank you, thank you for calling me.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1020 Thank you. Resuming then with the noise. One person is still registered to ask a question. I would remind you that if you want to ask a question about noise, now is the time to do it because the expert is here to answer your questions. Ms. Nicole Desrochers.

1025 MS. NICOLE DESROCHERS:

1030 Good evening, Madam Chairperson. I've asked this question in other BAPE hearings and, in fact, I think I asked it at a hearing where you were chairing, about Lavérendrye or the fifty - I know that there have been six (6) or seven (7) hearings in the area that have to do with road building or electrical issues or Hydro.

1035 Now, I'll ask the question to the proponent. Did they measure the noise over one (1) day? Did they measure the entire report or did they use the measurement out of only one (1) day's worth of data?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

I'll ask Mr. Jacques Boilard to answer this question.

1040 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

The measurements were done over two (2) days, but it's equivalent to one (1) day,

1045 really. But as I was saying earlier, noise measurement allows us to calibrate a software that works from average data that is given to us by the Ministry or the Transport Ministry.

So these measurements allow us to calibrate our model. And we use average data to determine what the impact will be.

1050 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

So when you say that you measured over two (2) days, but it's equivalent to one (1) day, you're talking about twenty-four (24) hours?

1055 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

Well, we had a twelve (12) hour survey to do which we started at the mid-point of the day. And we finished the following day, which means it was done over two (2) days.

1060 MS. NICOLE DESROCHERS:

The reason I'm asking this question is that some elements influence noise: the time of day and temperature. If it rains, sound carries much more than if it's dry. In the morning sound carries much more. And I'm going through my personal experience, I walk my dog every day, and I'm also working from professional experience as well.

1065 And I would say that measuring noise over one (1) day, one day where the weather is nice, measuring it at 06:00 a.m., if it's rainy, things will be different. As I said some models give different data. But I'll remind you that Mr. Beauchamp, during a public consultation on McConell Laramée asked the MTQ to go back to the drawing board because those components were not
1070 taken into account.

So he asked the minister of transport to take them into account. So it's a question I asked for every BAPE public hearing, because that's one component that always falls to the way-side when measurements are made.

1075 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

When you assessed the initial status...

1080 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

Well, don't forget that we're comparing the existing situation with the proposed situation. The existing situation will be influenced by temperature just as much as the future situation. So since this impact is relative, the impacts will be the same whether it's a day where the noise

1085 carries more than another.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1090 So you're forecasting a similar increase, however, the initial noise level would be higher in cases where noise carries more. For example when it's very damp or humid.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1095 Correct, the variance will remain the same however.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1100 I agree with you, but the reference levels that were taken over those two (2) days in April and August 2005, though these weren't representative, then your reference level is not right. It could be lower than reality, do you understand?

1105 If you add the hundred and twenty (120) extra trucks a day, then the increase of three (3) DBs would be higher. So are those measurements truly representative? Without challenging your results during our first visit here, we were on the road for two (2) hours. It was mid-day, and that was May 8th last, and we counted four (4) trucks over two (2) hours.

Was that happenstance? Perhaps. And perhaps the Ministry of Transport could explain. Are those periods a true reflection of truck traffic on the 301? I'm asking the question.

1110 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1115 As I said, those measurements allow us to calibrate our model or our software. So I can't tell you if that day was a true reflection of reality or not. But you can't forget that when we did our simulations on noise impact, we also increased the number of trucks by twenty-five percent (25%). So we gave ourselves a lot of leeway.

We calculated twenty-five percent (25%) more trucks than what is forecasted by the proponent.

1120 MS. NICOLE DESROCHERS:

1125 Despite that, as you say, if the basic reference point is erroneous because it's taken over twenty-four (24) hours and not three (3) consecutive days, according to the temperature, then do we really have a point to compare to?

And there's also the issue of distance. You measured at fifteen (15) metres, but five

hundred (500) metres could be more complex. Noise is not static. And we always have static data and that's the problem. It's very hard to measure when you have static data. And noise travels. Noise evolves according to the circumstances.

1130

THE COMMISSIONER:

Thank you.

1135

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Gilles Pelletier, still on the noise issue. Before hearing your question, Mr. Pelletier, is there anyone else who is registered with regard to noise? Anyone else in the room? Does anyone have a question on noise or is Mr. Pelletier the last person wanting to intervene? You have the floor, Mr. Pelletier.

1140

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

Good evening to all, my name is Gilles Pelletier. I would like to underscore that I'm still within the two (2) kilometres radius of LDC. I haven't been expropriated yet. And I would like to say that the noise emanating from this site will probably disturb us, especially when we'll be fishing on the river, we'll hear sounds.

1145

My wife, my children and I will not have access to our pristine forest and river anymore. And at some point, the same thing will be true of the mountains.

1150

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

That's pretty much a preamble to a question, there's no question?

1155

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

No, not really, all I'm saying is that we'll hear those sounds.

1160

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Okay. How do you take into account the fact that there can be a cottage where people go to relax, to live in a very tranquil environment, where the noise level should be very low. Did you take that impact into account in your noise assessment?

1165

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

Yes, Madam Chairperson. The hours of operation are such that on weekends,

1170 Saturdays and Sundays, the site will be shut down. And with regards to these measures, Mr. Boilard will answer your question.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1175 We conducted simulation of noise emanating from the site. The closest dwelling is over one (1) kilometre away and according to our simulations the noise levels in the worst case scenario, will be lower than forty (40) DBAs, perhaps even as low as thirty (30) DBAs. That is much lower than the noise levels that are standard for the evening or the night.

1180 The limit is forty (40) DBAs at night, and forty-five (45) during the day. We could operate up to forty-five (45) DBA by respecting the standards, but for this site, we'll be far lower than that.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1185 Could you get closer to the screen and explain what those colours represent, please? Please take the mike, please tell us where the river is and what the noise levels will be on the other side of the river? Do you have something to point with? Normally we have a pointer. We don't have it? We don't have a laser pointer.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1190 The result of our simulation with our software demonstrates - well, you can see the scale on the left, those are the noise levels. If you're in a blueish zone, you're below forty (40) DBA.

1195 As you can see, as the noise levels lessen quickly, the river, and I'm not sure where the river - where do you live? If I look at the colour, you'll be around forty (40) DBA, even below forty (40) DBA. We would have had to adjust the scale to have other noise levels. So the forty (40) DBAs is about where the square ends. And then it reduces far below forty (40) DBA in the blue zone.

1200 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

But will they hear noise on the other side of the river? Because this is an average, but when the trucks back up for example, will they hear it?

1205 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1210 It will depend on the current noise level of the dwelling. If there are rapids, for example, on the river, they won't hear it much. If it's completely quiet and nothing moves, than perhaps yes, they will hear it.

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

No, it's complete calmness and quiet and I think we'll hear it.

1215 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

Well, we're still within the Ministry of the Environment's standards.

1220 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

And when does covering of the site end? At what time does it end?

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1225 Thank you, Madam Chairperson, before the site closes, so normally between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., covering activities will be completed.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1230 This noise level, is it over a one (1) hour period, or twenty-four (24) hour period?

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1235 A one (1) hour period. But since the activities are the same during the period of day, there will be no variation, it should be the same noise level all day. We simulated with all equipments operational.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1240 Mr. Pelletier, do you go to your cottage very often?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

1245 Yes, very often, very often.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Especially on weekends?

1250 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

Weekends but during weekdays as well, because I'm retiring, so I'm there more often.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1255

So you intend on spending more time there during the summer. Do you also go in the winter?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

1260

In the winter, every weekend.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1265

Very well.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1270

Is your dwelling close to the river or are you higher up?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

1275

The cottage was built in 1968 and we're on rock face that dives into the water, we're about thirty (30) feet from the river.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

What's the elevation?

1280

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

From the water to the cottage, about ten (10) feet. But you can hear everything because when they cut the trees down there, we could hear the equipment. These people are going to be there all the time.

1285

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Now, in your model, do you take into account the fact that there could be echoes because there's a little bit of a valley there?

1290

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1295

Yes, we do take topography into consideration. What we did not take into consideration, and that could reduce noise, is the forest. If there's a tree - we're talking about a kilometre here. The forest between the site and the cottage would contribute to reducing the noise significantly.

We couldn't take it into consideration in this model, but that is a noise abatement measure, a natural noise abatement measure.

1300 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Are the cuts you're referring to close to the river?

1305 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

Yes, the cuts were done as close as they could go to the river. So we only have a small strip of just a few trees.

1310 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Thank you. We went to see and we saw really the river and how everything was flat. I mean, there were no rapids, I mean, the water was calm.

1315 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

Yes, it's a very nice river. It's a great area.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1320 Thank you.

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

Thanks to you.

1325

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1330 Are there any other questions relative to noise impact or the quality of the environment? One (1) question. Could you register? Please register so we have your name. And then we'll take a break, once the noise issue is dealt with, we will take a break.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1335 In the meantime, Mr. Boilard, it seems to me that it's hilly around there. And there's a hill between the 301 and the site. When we visited, that's what I noticed. And in your slide, there doesn't seem to be any indication of this.

1340 You said that you took topography into consideration. Now, I would have expected a greater variation in the profiles considering the actual topography, especially that hill that separates the 301 from the site.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1345 I'm told that that hill is found in the blue zone. So since our model --

THE COMMISSIONER:

So the hill precedes that square?

1350 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

Yes, it does.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1355 That answers my question then.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1360 Mr. Pelletier?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

1365 Yes, it came back to me. When you're on the deck or the wharf, when you say your name, your name echoes back to you. So there is a lag, and then you hear yourself when you're on the dock.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1370 Does that intensify the actual echo?

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1375 It depends on the distance the noise will travel before it is returned to its original area. Every time you double the distance, it loses six (6) DBs. So if the noise hits a hill, the echo will be lower than the original signal. So it all depends on how it's - what the circumstances are.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1380 But a river is not in a very deep valley at that particular area.

MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1385 Correct, but in that area, the noise levels emanating from the site will already be very low.
So even if there was a little bit of echo, it wouldn't change much to the results.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1390 And still on the noise, Kareen Little.

MS. KAREEN LITTLE:

1395 My question isn't exactly about noise, it's about vibrations from the trucks. We live at 362,
route 105, it's in central Kazabazua. And about a year ago, we had to replace seven (7) windows
that were broken from the vibration of trucks. And we live only about two (2) metres from the
sidewalk.

1400 And I just wondered if anyone had measured the impact of vibration if there's that many
more trucks.

MR. DONALD LABRIE:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson, I'll hand the floor over to Mr. Patrick Gagnon.

1405 MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

1410 With regard to vibration, Madam Chairperson, I'd like to table a document that was
published by NRC, National Research Council of Canada. And it's entitled: "Impact of traffic on
buildings" and vibration is explained in there.

In very rare cases, vibration does cause damage. And in this study, the conclusion, I can
read it out to you.

1415 It's quite possible that house owners will complain of damage caused by traffic vibration.
Damage to cracks, damage to the ceiling and walls. But this is attributable to other causes as
well. Vibration is rarely high enough to be directly linked to these cracks or damages.

That's why vibration is not necessarily the object of specific studies. In this document it

1420 says further that the components are normally related to residual elements in the soil, humidity cycles, movement of the ground, shifts and temperature. Lack of maintenance and works of renovation or repairs in the past.

1425 Low levels of vibration produced by traffic can be added then to residual effects to cause damage that occur in buildings. In that document which I will submit, it's clearly established, with regard to the parameters of traffic - vibration caused by traffic.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1430 Madam, the windows that you needed to change, that you had to change, were they all located on the front part of your property?

MS. KAREEN LITTLE:

1435 Yes, they all were, and the vibration is quite severe, it's not low from the trucks when they pass. Okay, I guess that's my question.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1440 You should - your case would have to be presented to complete the study that was carried out because there are overall studies, but there may be particular cases in which the situation - I mean, the evidence is there, isn't it. Can you come back to that?

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

1445 Yes, there may be particular cases. At that point, it would be question of requesting studies from the Ministry of Transport or from the authorities who are responsible for the maintenance of roadways and it then would have to be established that the degradation of that road might be a cause of the spreading vibration. So good maintenance of the road surface allows vibrations to be limited to a minimum.

1450 In extreme cases, given the nature of the soil or given some limits that these vibrations may be increased. But as a general rule, vibrations caused by traffic do not cause severe damage to buildings. Only if there are other elements, but people might link it to vibrations because these are - this is something that they may feel from time to time. But this is often caused by other effects and that's what the study brings out.

1455 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1460 In the present case, it's the windows that were changed were all facing the road, I think there may be a link that could be drawn here. Ms. Little, did you submit your file to the Ministry

of Transport. And the road in front of your house, is it in good condition or is it somewhat broken up? It seems to be in good condition?

MS. KAREEN LITTLE:

1465

Yes, but I'm not the only house in town that shakes from the trucks. A lot of houses do. And yes, that's basically seven (7) windows were mostly on the first floor and a couple on the second floor. But we are very close to the road.

1470

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Thank you for your presentation. Mr. Michel Turcot, please.

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

1475

Madam Chair, I have no questions prepared with regard to noise, but I had prepared questions. We're talking about the night time. Was there something I missed or will there be transportation carried out at night? And if ever that letter existed, I hope not, because the noise, there's a little levelling, whether I'm sleeping or whether I'm mowing a lawn, I hear them pass. It's as simple as that.

1480

So, I don't have any questions with regard to noise, but I'm hearing about, reading about night noise. Will there be transportation carried out at night as well?

1485

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

Thank you, Madam Chair. In fact there will no transportation at night. The site is in operation, including transportation in the day time only, five (5) days a week from Monday to Friday.

1490

The maximum opening hours will be from 07:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. that's guaranteed. There will be no transportation at night, I mean from 07:00 to 6:00 p.m. is already enough, but noise, there's no doubt about that.

1495

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Yes, steps have been taken to limit the situation because that's the way of doing things, establishing quality of the environment over a twenty-four (24) period at the outset. Ms. Mary Masotti.

1500

MS. MARY MASOTTI:

Mrs. Chairperson, Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Pelletier's questions led me to think of other

1505 problems along the river. Mr. Pelletier has a cottage within a certain distance of the dump. However, there are many people that enjoy canoeing and kayaking along the Picanoc river. And I was wondering if the promoters did evaluate the impact of this site, especially the noise level as people quietly fish along the river.

1510 I have seen children bobbing along with the current with their life jackets, kayakers going along quietly, taking pictures. And I'm wondering, outside of that small parameter that they evaluated the sound, did they look into the impact on people, recreational people on the river.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1515 The impact in terms of noise or --

MS. MARY MASOTTI:

1520 At this point, because we're looking at noise, I'm concerned about the noise.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

Thank you, Madam Chair, Mr. Boilard.

1525 MR. JACQUES BOILARD:

1530 You talk about the river that we see at the upper left? It's somewhat the same response as I gave to the gentleman earlier. The model shows that the level of noise in the worst situation, when all equipment is operating, would be lower than forty (40) DBs along the river.

So all of the environmental standards are being respected in that regard for day time period. (The gentleman indicates the river). The environmental standards are being respected. There is no specific calculation done regarding the river, but that's what it gives.

1535 MS. MARY MASOTTI:

1540 I have kayaked by the site, you cannot see the complete of the river winding around by the site itself. You're indicating it to the north I believe of the site. It does go right by, it does wind around and goes right by the site. And my cottage is three (3) kilometres from the village and there's quite a bit of forest between myself and the village and I hear the trucks on the highway in the quiet of the morning. So I can imagine in this area that the recreational users of the Picanoc would also hear a tremendous amount of noise.

1545 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

What we see on the map in question here, Madam Chair, the left-hand corner here is

1550 the closest point of the site to the river, the upper-left corner. And as for the noise that she hears from her cottage, I'm a few cottages away from here, and it's along the small roadway there and yes, I hear the noise of the trucks as well. And it's on the side where there are fields and it's much more open.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1555 Are there any other questions regarding noise? That's everything for that question? Thank you for your presentation. We'll take a ten (10) minute break. The registry remains open. And we'll also have questions regarding civil safety and emergency measures plans. We'll see you shortly.

1560 SHORT BREAK

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1565 We're going to start up again because we still have a lot of people on the registry. We have once again Mr. Pierre Ricard from municipal affairs. Is there anybody in the room who has already registered and who has questions for municipal affairs, municipal and regional affairs? One person who is registered. If you'd like to approach, please give your name.

1570 MR. JEAN-MARC BOUCHER:

Madam Chair, Mr. Commissioner, members.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1575 Your name?

MR. JEAN-MARC BOUCHER:

1580 Jean-Marc Boucher, I'm the owner of a cottage at Danford lake, not Danford lake, in the village but on lake Neil. This evening you asked the mayor a question which is very close to the events that I'm going to refer to. But I would like to ensure that my question is not - I assure you that my question is not strictly to do with the referendum.

1585 My question has to do with the procedure that was followed for review of the plan of urbanism for the municipality of Alleyn-et-Cawood. I will refer to two (2) very important events.

April 3rd, 2006 that you talked about this evening, where there was a public consultation

1590 and where some three hundred (300) people were present. Within the presence of two (2) officers from the Ministry of municipal affairs, the urban planner explained how citizens could participate in the process.

1595 The three (3) following things were mentioned. Citizens may ask questions on proposed regulations. Citizens could send in writing their objections within the following fifteen (15) days, including - and the municipality is obliged to respond to those questions. If there is a sufficient number of objections, the municipality must open a registry. And citizens will have the opportunity to register in that registry. And if the number goes above a certain percentage, there must be a referendum.

1600 The urban planner finished her explanations with the following words: "That is the law". So, the plan contained only one (1) reference to the TLS for the region that was being talked about.

1605 The second even that I will refer to, I think that it took place on June 12th at the Pontiac RCM. And the mayor of Alayn-et-Cawood asked the municipality of Pontiac to consider the possibility of having a TLS in the Alayn-et-Cawood municipality.

1610 The following question was asked: Was that request, to consider the TLS, does that request change the process? The very important part is as follows: The prefect of Pontiac asked the person who is present in the room here tonight and yesterday, to explain very clearly in both official languages, so that there would be no confusion, the rights of the citizens of Alayn-et-Cawood in the process of having a TLS in the municipality of Alayn-et-Cawood.

1615 The explanation was the same as that provided by the urban planner on April 3rd. Verbal questions, objections in writing, registry and referendum.

1620 Today, here we are at the BAPE without having had any of these recourses for citizens. For example, my questions did not obtain a response. I did not even receive an acknowledgment of the fact that I had asked the questions.

1625 My question is this: In the absence of respect for the law, in the way that it was explained to us at two (2) separate occasions, at the municipal level and at the RCM, is the project that we're discussing legal? How can we be at this stage without having followed the law as it was explained to us? Thank you.

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

It's a very good question. There are a number of underlying elements. First of all, I must say that I wasn't there when those meetings took place between the citizens, the representative

1630 of the ministerial branch and the urban planner for the municipality. So it is difficult for me to respond. But I imagine what took place and we're referring to two (2) things that are different.

The first thing that took place was that we started off with the idea that we could perhaps easily change the municipality's zoning so that the project we are discussing this evening could be
1635 acceptable through a change in zoning. And we realized over time that it might be preferable to look at going through a change in the plan.

When we move with a zoning change, there are very precise rules in the laws. There are procedures, there has to be a public information session where normally the mayor or the mayor's
1640 representative will explain what is the change in zoning that wants to be brought about. Am I going to quickly? Oh thank you.

So when we're changing a zoning, the mayor must explain the scope of the change and indicate to the citizen that they can react and in order to do so, there will be a registry opened.
1645 And citizens can be allowed to ask questions in writing. The municipality can in fact answer those questions. Generally, that's how it's done.

In some places they don't do it but the fact that the municipality offers to respond in writing is perfect. I have nothing to say to that.
1650

Once the public information session is held, the municipality should normally have a registry unless there is a refusal on the part of the taxpayers concerned to go through with the signing of a registry. Citizens may decide that the changes that are proposed are so attractive that it's useless to have a registry, that they agree. Then it will be done in writing and obviously, there
1655 needs to be proof of that.

If that's not done, that means that we need to move forth with a registry and there must then be a day for signing the registry. And at the end of that day, the clerk or the secretary-treasurer counts and through a mathematical calculation provided for in the law on elections and referendums, decides whether there are sufficient numbers of signatories. If so, the municipal council must decide if there will be a referendum or not.
1660

There is no obligation to go ahead with a referendum. It is a decision of the council. If the council decides to go ahead with a referendum because they think that it was presented valid and it is good for the municipality, they will move ahead with the referendum. And the referendum procedure applies, that is that there must be sums of money invested to hold that referendum because there must be a referendum list. People must be hired to hold the election. Because it's like an election, the question must be decided.
1665

That is in the procedure related to zoning changes. When we go to the RCM for a change or to the development plan, there may be public consultations. The law provides for
1670

1675 cases in which there are, but in some cases there are not. That is that the only consultation that takes place is when there is the adoption at the council of a regulation or of a proposal which is put forth. People have an ordinary session of the council. There's a question period and people can put forth their points of view.

1680 Obviously the mayor who represents the municipality can also state the position of the council. The mayor, when he sits on the RCM, is a member of the RCM council and it's as a councillor of that, council that he sits and not as a mayor of the municipality. So there's a certain latitude in the way in which he can exercise his presence there.

I believe that I've answered the question, I hope so.

1685 MR. JEAN-MARC BOUCHER:

You referred to many processes in which - which we're aware of. My point is that we have never had the chance to go to a registry which may or may not lead us to a referendum. The other point that I want to raise is that the objections were made in a great number and I do not understand why the registry was never opened.

1690 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1695 As it was explained this afternoon, even if there had been a referendum, it would not have been decisive, that is that the RCM, if I've understood correctly, it's the RCM that can unilaterally decide if a site is to go forward, a regional site is to go forward, with regard to the change of regulations and interim controls.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1700 I think that there is some confusion with regard to procedures that are to be followed. In terms of the local municipality, Mr. Ricard was talking a little earlier about changes or amendments to the zoning regulations.

1705 There are two (2) types of procedures to modify a zoning regulation. The first procedure is the adoption of regulations following the implementation of the revised development planning that might be a change to the zoning regulation, construction regulations, et cetera.

1710 At that point, if we enter into that process, there is, I'll try to be brief to clarify things. There's a first project that's adopted by the municipality. Then it goes into public consultations after which it adopts with or without changes its regulation, which then needs to be approved by the RCM.

The second procedure for change in urban design is when the council, under its own

1715 initiative, changes zoning. And there we have supplementary steps. There's a first project, then public consultation in which information is provided. A second project which includes all of the elements likely to be - to bring about a referendum. For example, the authorization of new use. Then, opening of registries.

1720 If there is a minimal number of people eligible to vote, that's how it's stated in the law, at that point a referendum is held. What Mr. Ricard may not have said is that the municipality, before deciding to open a registry following the public consultation, it can simply abandon the project at that point, or it may decide to open the registry and if it sees that too many people signed the registry, it can still abandon the project. It's strictly a political decision.

1725 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

That was all said this afternoon but at a concrete level, at the end of all that, what I asked as a question was that even if there was a referendum and people said no in sufficient numbers, the RCM could still have - put forth a regulation for interim control to implement new technical regulations on the territory where citizens had expressed themselves enough against.

1730

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

You have to get into the context where the mayor of the municipality Alayn-et-Cawood, who is a councillor in the municipal council of Pontiac, made a request to, first of all, ask the councillors of the council to identify a site as a regional site in this municipality. And that was a first recognizance of that site for those purposes.

1735

Then, given that we had our management plan in which it was stated that it was in our interest to consider a technical landfill site in our area. So it opened the plan up in the RCM and the process moved further from the local level, from the municipal level.

1740

At that point, when we adopt interim control, regulation at the RCM, in the law on urban affairs, there's no public consultation. If we decided to go through a change of the development plan, we would have gone through about the same process and at the level of the local municipality. That is that a first project is adopted. There's a public consultation and then, there's the adoption with or without changes of the regulation.

1745

And the gentleman was referring to June 12th, there was an attempt to adopt a change regulation which was abrogated following that when there was the adoption of a interim control regulation. So it's the process that was followed from the start according to the law.

1750

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

1755 I may add some more to that. When we move into a referendum with regard to changes

1760 in the territories specifically with regard to zoning, if there's a referendum, the council is bound by the referendum. But when there's a referendum of a consultative nature, for example if I decided to - if the council decided tomorrow morning to consult its citizens on the effect that it wants to build, for example, there's an arena project that they want to build and they want to know if citizens agree with it or not. Morally the council is bound but practically, it can decide that even if the citizens don't want it, they can still build it.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1765 And in the case --

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

1770 In the case of a change in zoning, if there's a referendum, the council will be bound, but it's not obliged to do it. So generally they don't do it because there are costs involved. When we don't move forth with it, the regulation is withdrawn and it doesn't apply.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1775 That we understand. But the RCM could still have passed an interim control regulation?

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

1780 It could - territorial development is the responsibility of the RCM, so if the RCM decides that an infrastructure is important, it can decide that - to make a change without a plan or it passes an interim control regulation and that's the end of it.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1785 That's what I was saying. Have I understood correctly, even if there was a referendum, and if the result was that the majority was against it, there could still have been an intervention on the part of the RCM, is that right what I'm saying there?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1790 It's absolutely right.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1795 That's what I understood.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1800 That's what you need to understand if - but you need to understand that in the type of project that we have at present, we have the procedure here and there are other procedures. There are authorizations to obtain, et cetera, et cetera. It's certain that when the authorizations are required, obviously we look at everything that's involved, and we also look at how the population receives the project. It's as though we were building an airport or something else, the same principle applies.

1805

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Okay, we've pretty well covered the question. I won't continue on that question.

1810

MR. JEAN-MARC BOUCHER:

I would like, I don't know if I have the right to make two (2) points. First of all, my question was not to do with the referendum, that's what I said at the start. The second point is that the reason for which the question was asked on June 12th, that request to consider the TLS for Alleyn-et-Cawood, did that change the process?

1815

The process was confirmed in the two (2) languages and nothing of those other alternatives to the process was identified. That was the reason for the question. And those processes were not presented to us.

1820

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Thank you. Are there any other questions to the Ministry of municipal affairs? Yes, if you would like to go and give your name. Mr. Ricard, yes, at that point you give your name when you come up front. Are you already registered.

1825

MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

Yes. Thank you, I will be briefly covering grounds that we've already covered. But I would like to deal specific --

1830

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Your name?

1835

MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

Oh, Paul Dingleline, I'm sorry, I've been here so many times. I'd like to speak, Mr.

1840 Ricard, specifically to the question of why the first process was stopped and the second one was started. At the February council meeting, the February town council meeting this year, the question of rezoning came up. And I asked on behalf of the coalition, I asked Mayor Squitti would there be a consultation process in the course similar to the one that had been promised the previous year.

1845 He answered that yes, there would be a process but it was a consultative process. In other words, and I'm quoting as best as I can remember, he said: "You can express your views but they won't make any difference." And then he said: "And that's why we did it this way." And that is a direct quote.

1850 So it's very clear that the express purpose of killing the first process and starting the second was to prevent the citizens from having a say in the process. That is what he said. And my question for Mr. Ricard is: is that your understanding that the process was switched specifically to avoid the citizens having a say?

1855 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Mr. Ricard.

1860 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

I won't give you my personal impression but I will say that the municipal council reviewed its options. Obviously, the municipal council took note of the community's feelings and found itself in a situation that led it to understand that its impression or understanding of the legislation was possibly incorrect.

1865 That's to say that the zoning regulation or zoning by-laws in a municipality did not permit the implementation of TLS, which is why the municipality had to modify its zoning to allow this possibility. And I would remind you that it is a possibility.

1870 The municipal council therefore returned to the MRC and asked if the MRC could perhaps change zoning by adopting a special regulation. Once that was done, it allowed for discussions and the review of the project. I would say that the choice was almost made mandatory in the sense that we had to turn to the MRC to see if perhaps a TLS could be considered in that site.

1875 And as I said this morning, all municipal by-laws with regard to zoning, have to conform to the zoning plan. For the TLS to be in accordance with this plan, it had to be part of the municipal urban planning plan.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1880

So it was in your opinion an obligation to create this special regulation?

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

1885

My personal impression was that the municipality had to adopt special regulations. I don't think it would have been possible to simply change zoning because the development plan did not allow for it, am I right, Pierre, the development plan did not allow for it.

1890

So perhaps our procedure wasn't correct, but we found ourselves in a situation where we had no other choice but to turn to the MRC to see if we could perhaps discuss the implementation of that project. It has to be part of the development plan if we want to look at its feasibility.

1895

You have to understand that in a development plan, you find a lot of things. There's not necessarily an obligation to achieve everything that's part of that development plan. That development plan changes.

The Pontiac development plan was adopted in '98

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1900

No, in '99.

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

1905

Normally, that's reviewed every five (5) years. We'll probably undertake the third revision this year.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1910

Please introduce yourself.

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

1915

I am a resident of Kazabazua. If I understand correctly --

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Questions with regard to municipal affairs, because he'll be leaving.

1920 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

I had two (2) questions but after posing the first one, I would like to register to ask a second question. Can I ask both?

1925 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Yes, ask both. Is it all dealing with municipal affairs?

1930 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

Yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1935 Do them all at once then.

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

1940 My first question is as follows: when a resident or citizen loses his confidence in his municipal council, I would like to know what process and steps are in place to remove their responsibilities from them? That is my first question.

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

1945 In the legislation as it stands now, citizens have to live with their elected body for the entire term. In this case, there was a vote in 2005 and you will have to live with them until 2009. Citizens can ask their elected representative to resign, but there's no obligation on the part of the elected body to do so.

1950 Democracy is as is. The mandate or the term is four (4) years in length and you have to live with the elected representatives that you have elected. Citizens are responsible for electing the representative that they want and they have to live with their choice.

I know that this is not the answer you're looking for but this the only answer I can provide.

1955

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

So we won't have Danfordgate.

1960 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

No.

1965 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

They managed to impeach the President of the United States of America.

1970 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

Yes, but in the USA there is a procedure called impeachment. It's part of the constitution. Now in my case, I live with the acts that the legislator has given us. And he has not provided for impeachment for municipal elected representatives. If there were corruption or fraud, we could use the courts to have them step down. But only a court can make it mandatory for a representative to leave their role.

1975 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

Are these provided for in the legislation?

1980 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

Yes, they are, the reasons are part of the legislation.

1985 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

Could I see those reasons?

1990 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

There are many reasons.

1995 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

Could you file that here at the BAPE?

2000 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

Of course I can table that information, but it's part of the legislation on referendum election between sections 300, off the top of my head, 300 and 308.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Could you file those sections of the act?

2005 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

Absolutely, yes I can do that.

2010 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

Thank you, my second question is as follows: I found out yesterday that this is still a public land. How can a citizen buy that property and change its nature in the sense that how can a citizen prevent the construction of anything on that lot to protect the rivers that flow through that land, the two (2) rivers?

2015

How can a citizen buy that property and make sure that the nature of the property, I don't know if that's the correct expression, but that nothing will ever be built on that property except perhaps a water bottling company because, as we heard on the news today, water will be more expensive than gas at some point.

2020

So how perhaps citizens would be better served if they bottled their water. In an area like this that gives you twenty-four (24) square meters of water per hour, rather than build a landfill site? Now I digress, but my question was how can a citizen buy that property because it's mine.

2025

And how can I make sure that there will never be any project such as the one that is presented today?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2030

And this question is addressed to the natural resources ministry.

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

2035

As far as buying public property, under the act to sell such property to a citizen, it goes through calls for proposals. The minister has to decide to sell public property and therefore the highest bidder gets it.

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

2040

Is this a process that will be established for this case? Will the minister publish a call for proposals so that people can buy that property?

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

2045 However, no, it is possible to alienate property for projects that are commercial, institutional in nature or even at a community level or municipal level for public services, public utilities for example. Therefore a project has to be tabled and there has to be a request for purchase.

2050 You can't forget that the minister does have discretionary power and is never forced to sell property. When a project is tabled, the ministry reviews IT and if there are no constraints on rights that are attached to this public property, because as you know, there could be, for example, forestry contracts or mining contracts associated to this public land.

2055 If there is no interference with other rights, the ministry can, for specific projects that the ministry feels will create jobs for example. Or that they will have interesting economic repercussions for a community, if the local and regional levels agree to it, the ministry will consider them for the development of that area without going through the call for proposals, for properties that the ministry would like to sell, where the use would not be at play.

2060

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2065 Since these are - this is public property, is there a consultation process associated to it, because this is public property, the government therefore is the stuart of the land, not the owner of the land. The property belongs to all Quebecers. In that sense, is there a consultation process to determine if the host community or the broader community, if the project is in line with the type of development that the community wishes?

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

2070

2075 There is not consultation process as such set out in the legislation. However, the minister must be accountable to the population especially when there's a question of alienation of land. Because you have to understand that if there is alienation, public property is given to a private owner, so the mechanisms in place for the minister provide for consultation in the sense that the local and regional levels have to demonstrate support.

2080 And the proponent must relay this information to the minister to explain that there are no problems with regard to the development of the municipality. And that the population has been made aware of the project. But there's no real procedure if you will, set out in the legislation.

2080

 What's important in the review of the project is that the proponent or the applicant must always justify his need for space. The ministry does not like to rent or sell property if it's not necessary. That's why it's important in any project, that the applicant for public land specifies that need for space.

2085

It could be, for example, dependent upon the equipment that has to be used, the parking that has to be provided for, all kinds of situations that lead to the review of necessary space.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2090

When Aboriginal people have a claim to that land, is that taken into consideration of the - is that taken into the consideration when the minister decides to sell or not?

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

2095

Yes, of course. At the natural resources ministry, we do consult Aboriginal peoples and that is a requirement for different types of activities. But yes indeed, should there be a land claim that could prevent a sale.

2100

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

In the present case, are you aware of that?

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

2105

As far as I know, there has not been any consultation with the Aboriginal population.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2110

Do you know if there's a land claim attached to that land?

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

2115

Not as far as I know but Mr. Bouillon, who was our representative for the Aboriginal peoples could check this out for you and come back with an answer during the next coming days.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Very well.

2120

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

2125

Can I, may I? I did not have this question prior to the answers I heard. How can a citizen tell the MRC that he or she disagrees with a project? Because it now has been taken up by the MRC?

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

2130 There are two (2) ways, the first way, the most usual one, is to go to the townhall meeting for the MRC which is the same as the municipal townhall meetings. There's a period of questions - there's a question period normally and residents can express or voice their concerns there.

2135 The other way which is quite common, is people who disagree with a project can write to the reeve and explain their claims. You should receive an answer through both methods. But those are the only two (2) ways that are provided for currently in a legislation.

They are elected representatives. But at the MRC you don't vote for all of them. The reeve in la Vallée-de-l'Outaouais is the only elected representative in the area.

2140 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Are there any other questions for the representative of the ministry, municipal affairs ministry?

2145 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

2150 My name is Michele Borchers and I would like to ask in the case of the technical landfill site, we're not talking about changing lights or resurfacing a road, we're talking about a project that will have an impact on generations to come if not centuries to come.

My question is as follows: How is it that in 2007 in Québec, in Canada, a democratic country, the legislation has not provided for a mechanism to prevent elective representatives to determine the destiny of its citizens without their consent?

2155 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

2160 I'm not the legislator myself and I have to live with the same problems that you do in the sense that I elect my own representatives as well. I'm quite uncomfortable answering your question.

On the local level, there are mechanisms with regard to planning, development plans. There are certain provisions. The elected representatives have a role to play in this consultation process.

2165 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

But the elected representatives have been elected to represent the people who elected

them. I think it's very well that we have laws and regulations, but what about ethics and morality?

2170 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Madam Borchers, I would ask you to speak to this in the second part.

2175 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

No, but my question was does the government not have moral authority over the elected representatives?

2180 MR. PIERRE RICARD:

We do have moral authority, however, municipalities are governments, they are independent. They have their own powers and since they are based on democracy, the conception we have of our society is that the elected body is accountable for the decisions it makes.

2185

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Is anyone else looking to speak to municipal affairs? Please state your name.

2190 MR. STACY MOLYNEAUX:

My name is Stacy Molyneaux, you should have it up there about four (4) times now.

2195 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

It's for the transcript, you must give your name for the transcript.

2200 MR. STACY MOLINEAUX:

First of all, before I ask my question, I have put my name on the register four (4) times and I had to come up on my own here without being called and that's fine. I had a question for the mayor and it was left aside. And when you asked is there anymore questions for the mayor, I put my hand up and I was brushed aside again.

2205

But anyways, on the topic of referendum, living in Quebec, I can understand why a lot of people would be afraid of that, even the name of it. Some politicians when in power, decided that maybe separating from Canada at one time would be a good idea. But instead of unilaterally deciding on their own, they did what any true democracy would do in that position.

2210 They held a referendum and let the people decide their own fate. When it comes to my future, my children's future, that of family and friends, I say we should have the option of deciding what that future will be. Can we take a step backward, hold a referendum not on zoning, just on whether or not we want a dump, I don't care what the zone is.

2215 Let the community decide their own future. If not, will the board of MRC, councillors, secretary, mayor of Alayn-et-Cawood, Denis Rouleau, anyone else involved with taking away our democratic rights be willing to sit before a board, a public board of inquiry and explain how the project got this far, disclose any conflict of interest on the part of all involved. And if any incentives were offered to anyone in power to get this project this far, be they monetary value or otherwise on
2220 the part of Denis Rouleau.

So far, I feel that this whole process is baloney for lack of a better word. We went through all kinds of meetings, meetings after meetings after meetings. I look at your big sign over here and it says: "Your parti... I can't read French but it says: Your participation, I think is essential." I
2225 think also it would be essential for somebody with some knowledge to be here.

When we ask a question "Oh, we'll try to get the person on the phone. Come with us tomorrow. Meet us in Gatineau. Come back." I was here last night till 11:00. I was here all day today. And this is my first chance to ask a question.

2230

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Could you tell us exactly what your question is in very simple terms?

2235

MR. STACY MOLYNEAUX:

Can we take a step backward and hold a referendum, not on zoning, just on whether or not the people want a dump site?

2240

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

The answer is could the municipal council hold a referendum? Of course it could. It could always have an advisory referendum to find out if the population agrees with the project. That's possible. It's always been possible in any case but then again, the elected representatives hold that power. It's up to them to decide if yes or no, there should be a referendum.
2245

I can do nothing else for you. I'd like to tell you something else but that is the act. The legislation lets the representatives decide if there should or should not be an advisory referendum

2250 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Sir, this week you'll be working with your fellow citizens to make these hearings work. And this has a reason for being. We have these consultations to listen to people. So in the second part, you can come tell us your opinion. And we would invite the entire community to come tell us how they see the project. And this will be relayed to the government and will be part of the BAPE's report.

We will explain what the perception of the community is with regard to this project. And the decision will be made by cabinet ultimately.

2260

MR. STACY MOLYNEAUX:

Can I just ask you your personal opinion, of course you don't have to answer. But the way this is all going, do you believe in your mind that we are in a democracy or are we in a dictatorship?

2265

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Are you asking me that question? To whom are you asking that question?

2270

MR. STACY MOLYNEAUX:

Yes, to you.

2275 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

Democracy evolves and through time and the decades, democracy evolves. We haven't reached perfection, but I believe that Quebec's approach to make sure that citizens can express their opinion, voice their concerns at home. That they don't have to go to courts to be represented by counsel, that they can explain how they feel in their own words and obtain an answer to their questions, that is a simple approach that a lot of countries don't have the benefit of having.

2280

There are other ways that are taken, especially in Europe for example. There are additional steps that are taken that are forward thinking but I feel that Quebec's experience is to observe what happens in other jurisdictions and to follow suit if it applies here.

2285

We're doing everything we can and at the municipal level as well. So it's up to the citizens to exercise their rights at all levels, whether it's on the municipal level, at the MRC level or then at the level of the government of Quebec. You can also express your point of view to the people who represent you.

2290

MR. STACY MOLYNEAUX:

2295 Thank you. The second part of my question wasn't answered and I'd like to direct it to Mr. Rouleau. Mr. Rouleau, have you offered any incentives to people in positions of power, whether it be monetary value or otherwise, to a person, not to the municipality itself as a whole?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2300 We find the question inappropriate, Madam Chairperson.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2305 Could you answer in general terms?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

No, we did not give any sort of bribe to anyone.

2310 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

You've answered the question.

MR. STACY MOLYNEAUX:

2315 Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2320 Any other questions for the municipal affairs ministry?

MR. ANDRÉ CARRIÈRE:

2325 Good evening, Madam Chairperson, my name is André Carrière and I am the president of the coalition against the mega dump in Danford Lake. I will try to make my question as clear as possible.

2330 Throughout the discussion that has just unfolded with regards to citizens' rights to express their opinion on a project that will have a major impact on their work place and perhaps on their health, if not other things, we've only alluded to the municipality of Alleyn-et-Cawood and to the Pontiac MRC.

Municipal affairs have described an approach that is part of that sphere of the

2335 municipality and the MRC. So the measures undertaken by the Pontiac MRC apply to municipalities that are part of Pontiac.

2340 My question for municipal affairs is as follows: Since the proposed site is said to be regional for all of the Outaouais region, would it not be logical, since it involves the municipalities that comprise Outaouais, that this question be raised to the regional level. And that being the case, should there not be regional consensus with regard to waste management and waste management options?

2345 Currently, we feel that we live in a bubble where the only possibility that's feasible is a site in Danford Lake that would serve all of the Outaouais area. Should there not be regional consensus, something that would consider all options, not only the TLS?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2350 This question would be addressed normally to the municipality, the county, and do you have anything to say, however, with regard to municipal affairs? Yes, go ahead.

MR. PIERRE RICARD:

2355 The reeve's regional council of elected officials decided to deal with all the residual files and make that a regional file. So the table of Reeves formed a technical committee whose report was tabled this afternoon before the commission. And discussions are underway. You undoubtedly were able to hear them this afternoon. You know that the mayor of Gatineau came in with another option.

2360 So the issue is being rendered regional and as far as I know with regard to this issue, we're not looking only at the possibility of a TLS, we're looking at all the opportunities that may be open to the region to dispose of its waste.

2365 However, in the discussions that took place, we became aware that the treatment of residual waste must be done within the region, and we hope to avoid exporting waste as is the case present for the majority of MRCs and city of Gatineau.

2370 You know that the city of Gatineau is a major exporter of waste to Lachute. So yes, there's a will, there's a vision on a regional level for everything regarding residual matters, which wasn't the case, I would say, as little as four (4) years ago.

MR. ALAIN MERCIER:

2375 (Translation) Alain Mercier, Pontiac, we determined that we needed to decide upon a single site for the creation of a technical landfill site in our area. We carried out this exercise, so

that we wouldn't find ourselves with two (2) or three (3) projects like this one or whatever the alternative solution might be.

2380 The same exercise, in my opinion, should have been carried out in the other MRC's in case that there would be a technical landfill site. In my opinion, each of the MRC's should have had an interim control regulation set up with this regard. So, this is my personal opinion.

2385 With regard to the City of Gatineau, the context is a particular one. They are looking at a site within the territory of the city itself. I won't speak on the City of Gatineau's behalf, but as with regard to the acquisition of a site for the creation of a TLS, we have carried out the exercise, which is not the case of the other MRC's in the region.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2390 (Translation) The City of Gatineau.

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

2395 (Translation) I would just like to add a little clarification. In terms of the City of Gatineau, this goes back a number of years. The Outaouais urban committee, a number of studies had been carried out to find a landfill site within the Outaouais urban territories commission - territory. A number of sites had been identified, but they were found to be in agricultural territory. And each time the Outaouais urban community was refused the right to use those sites. So, that's based on that the urban community began to export its waste.

2400 And as I said last night, the city is expecting to carry out a study in order to evaluate the long-term possibilities for the city, to look at what would be the best way for the city in the medium and long term to deal with its residual waste.

2405 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2410 (Translation) We will undoubtedly talk about that tomorrow further, thank you. Is that all in terms of Municipal Affairs? Yes, thank you very much; have a good trip back. We come back now to the list of questions. We also have someone, the Minister responsible for Public Safety. That person would also like to leave not too late, if possible, I imagine. So, if you have questions for public safety, would you like to indicate in the room if you have questions for the Ministry of Public Safety? No questions for the Ministère de la sécurité publique? Well, we'll go ahead immediately.

2415 MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

(Translation) I would just like to clarify that, more specifically, it's civil safety, sécurité civile.

2420 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) In the answers to the questions that you had addressed to the promoter, your Ministry seemed to be concerned with the safety or the emergency measures regarding the creation of this project in the region, notably with regard to traffic, potential accidents, and evacuation routes. Could you summarize a little bit the concerns of your Ministry?

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

(Translation) I can simply reread what I had said. We stated that, in Section 6.2.3.4, page 216 of the primary report of the impact study, we would like to have the study define further the public safety for transportation for dangerous matters, and safety for local traffic, and heavy trucks during the operation of the site. We have seen no comment with regard to that in the promoter's documents. It's for highway traffic. Because we had two (2) draft answers. This is the one from December 13th, 2006.

And that of April 2nd, 2006, we talked about if there were a traffic accident on 105 and 301. With regard to the evacuation of the population in the case of an emergency, have there been any plans made in case that massive evacuations were required? For us, our area of concern was the security of people and goods.

So, it was just a questioning of the proponent with regard to traffic safety during construction, and we wanted to build awareness with regard to the fact that, during construction, there would be a lot more traffic that could possibly require seeing containment areas and evacuation routes in situations of emergency.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Does that have - it has not so much to do with the nature of the goods that will be transported, but the increase in the number of trucks. So, it's not due - your concerns are not associated with the nature of the waste that will be transported in the truck.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

(Translation) Well, there is that as well, yes, the nature, if there's traffic of a dangerous material, residual matter, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) So, it's not dangerous goods as such, but it's the traffic, the truck traffic, that concerns you more than the potential accidents that could take place.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2465 (Translation) Well, that point is not the most important point. Let's see. How should I say this? It's more the emergency measures plan that concerned us more. Could you repeat your question, please? If our concern...

THE COMMISSIONER:

2470 (Translation) What concerned you was the heavy truck traffic following an accident. There could be jams and the need for rapid evacuation. It's at that level that you are asking if there were emergency measures that had been planned out.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2475 (Translation) If that had been planned with the construction of the site and the establishment of that sort of site, was that provided for? I think it was raised yesterday and also this afternoon that there would be an increase in traffic. We're talking about two (2) lanes. We're talking about the two (2) provincial highways. We talked about that yesterday. And so, we had that concern, and we raised that.

2480

THE COMMISSIONER:

2485 (Translation) And can the proponent give us his point of view on the emergency measures?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2490 (Translation) Yes, thank you, Mr. Commissioner; I will pass it over to Mr. Poulin.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2495 (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Commissioner; it was provided for that, first of all, we can confirm that the entire question of the nature of the matter to be transported is non-dangerous residual matter. So, straight away, that entirely changes the emergency measures plan.

2495

2500 Secondly, during the construction phase, the majority of the materials, construction materials, are found basically on site. So, the activity and highway traffic will not be greatly increased, maybe a bit because of employees, but it's minimally, because the majority of the materials are already there.

2500

Thirdly, as for an accident during the operation of the site, we're talking about the sixty

2505 (60) trucks that are distributed throughout the ten (10) hours of operation. You understand that it's about one truck every ten (10) minutes, if they were distributed evenly. Obviously, that's not the cases. There are peak periods, but one could say that there are about one (1) to two (2) trucks per ten (10) minutes.

2510 So, if there were an accident that brought about the complete blockage of the 105 or the 301, each municipality, within its territory, has a plan for emergency measures with civil security and the municipality. So, that regional emergency plan exists, I think, in each municipality. It's a requirement to prepare - it's a requirement of the Ministry of Civil Security. So, there are already plans in place.

2515 There needs to be harmony between the emergency measures plan of the transporter, because LDC Environmental Management Services is not a transporter of residual matters, but rather a landfill site. So, the transporter in each of the sections of the municipalities, in cooperation with the municipality and the Ministry of Civil Security, must coordinate that, those situations, but, on a practical level, if there are accidents causing traffic problems, it's possible to go on the other side of the 301 and go around on the other side. So, let's say that --

2520 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Can you show us that on a map, how you can go around on the other side?

2525 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Yes, in terms of transcription here...

2530 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Because I'm a little lost in that.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2535 (Translation) Here you see the Gatineau here. Let's say there's an accident on the 105 here or on the 301 just in here. The alternative would be to continue on the 301 up to the 148 to come back to Gatineau. Yes, it's a bit long, but it's an alternative. It's a provincial road, trucking routes as well.

2540 I repeat, Denis, that it's up to the Ministry of Civil Security to provide for those emergency measures. It's up to the Ministry of Civil Security, and it's not up to the owner of a landfill site to say that you are to go to the 148 and go around. It's up to the Ministry itself.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2545

(Translation) May I answer? First of all, we're not the Ministry of Civil Security. We're the Ministry of Public Safety in Quebec. Within it, we have a branch of civil security and which is fire safety, and it's not up to the Ministry of Public Safety - it's getting late - to provide for emergency measures in terms of evacuation and alternative routes. The Ministry of Transport is not here, but it may be their area of expertise.

2550

The civil security branch, we work with the municipality, and we support them. One of our tasks is to advise them and support them to develop emergency response plans. In the project in question here, the neighbouring municipalities, I've identified three (3) of them, but there are probably more. We're talking about Kazabazua, who has emergency response plan which is updated in 2005. In Alwyn-and-Cawood, it's being drawn up. There's Otter Lake. I saw that it was somewhat close, but I might be mistaken here. It's not clear with regard to that municipality.

2555

I'm sorry to contradict you, but I think I know my branch a little better than you might, but we also have this concern with regard to when a municipality draws up an emergency response plan, there's a general plan, but the municipality might provide for ten (10) or more specific plans. The municipality needs to evaluate and the MRC as well, but, first of all, the municipality assesses its vulnerability within its territory, so what risks might affect its territory. We might talk about ten (10) or twelve (12) municipalities that have a plan that's up to date that contain containment and evacuation plans.

2560

2565

In this case, what you showed me, the concern, if a person needs to be evacuated, because the person is sick, and the ambulance and all that, it might take some time, but I understand, of course, that we brought that concern forth, and this forum tonight might not be the place to try to establish a route for evacuation, because there might be other points as well that I would like to discuss.

2570

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2575

(Translation) In fact, Mme. Chair, what's the difference then between a truck transporting waste and a truck transporting logs which are using the routes right now? Do the transporters of logs have emergency response plans?

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2580

(Translation) I don't think that - the comment had to do with when a company sets up within a territory, there's a risk that comes with it. So, there's no doubt that, on the 105, the 301, there's traffic. It's just that, with that site, there will be even more traffic, okay. So, I'm not here to talk about whether a trucking company has its emergency response plan. I don't know. You'd have to bring in trucking companies, but I can tell you that, the technical landfill site, we

2585

expect an emergency response plan for the workers who will be there.

2590 You talked about neighbouring municipalities. That's a very important point, links to the other communities. That's a very important point to address. Excuse me, I was talking to the proponent, but it's an important point that the proponent needs to take into account in - go ahead.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2595 (Translation) But, on a concrete level, what the proponent should do with the municipality to tie its emergency response plans for transportation, for the transportation companies, if it's going to work, and with the municipality. On a concrete level, what is to be changed? What has to be done?

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2600 (Translation) I don't know, and I'm not here to talk about emergency response plans for transportation. There's the Ministry of Transport in Quebec which exists, and they have an emergency response at the regional level and municipal level. And with regard to traffic, trucks, and all that, there are people with - who are in a much better position than myself to talk about that.

2605

THE COMMISSIONER:

2610 (Translation) You were talking a little earlier about the municipality of Alayn-and-Cawood, which would have to tie its emergency response plan in with the Ministries, and you could provide your services for that. In what way could you intervene, and what should the municipality do to alter its emergency response plan, taking into account the increased truck traffic?

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2615

(Translation) I have no idea.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2620 (Translation) Okay, and on the site, you were saying that --

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2625 (Translation) Yes, when we made our comments at this stage, at the ministerial consultation for the impact study, we mentioned that we were expecting the proponent to have

an emergency response plan in place with the civil security.

2630 When we made our comments and provided our opinion, we were basing it on the
directive of the - of Environmental Affairs, and that directive produced by the MDDEP, the
Environmental Affairs Directorate, concerning that project to create a sanitary landfill site at
Danford Lake, according to that directive, at this stage, when our comments were made for the
impact study, the promoter - when it's a project to establish a sanitary landfill site, the proponent
does not have to draw up an emergency response plan. However, if it had been for an
2635 environmental impact study for an industrial project, yes, you would have to have all those
elements.

2640 So, I should just mention perhaps that, in this case, we - one might just raise the good
faith or collaboration of the proponent, who took our points of view into account and tried to further
develop that sort of thing, but we cannot ask for more than - because we're at the impact study
level here.

2645 And when - if ever this project were to go ahead - I don't know how to call this. It's an
industry or enterprise, the project, thank you. If it became concrete, it would no longer be a
project. The site would have to have an emergency response plan for its workers, just as any
other type of industry or enterprise.

2650 And it needs to harmonize this plan with the neighbouring municipalities. That means that
the neighbouring municipalities need to have an emergency response plan. I can tell you that,
with regard to the neighbouring municipalities, there are - there's one (1) out of three (3) that has a
plan. Another one is very confused, and one has one that is being drawn up. So, it will take
collaboration and cooperation.

2655 And even under the law in civil security, it's very clear with regard to that. It states that
when an industry which has the possibility of generating risks to the public in the area in which it
will be establishing must provide its emergency response plan. It's called a civil security plan. It's
the same thing, and it must provide its plan to the municipality which - upon whose territory it's
being established.

2660 So, what we expect also is that the enterprise carry out a vulnerability study with regard to
its dangers to the safety of people and property. I'm somewhat surprised to see here today that
there are three (3) cottages within the parameter. I didn't think there were. I'll go away with that
information and that concern as well. Am I clear?

2665 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Yes, maybe just to complete or to see that I understood that emergency
response plan, a company is required to present it, but it needs to prepare it and harmonize it

with those of the neighbouring municipalities.

2670 MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

(Translation) Yes, at this step, we're doing an impact study, and we cannot require more.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2675

(Translation) I have no further questions.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2680

(Translation) Any questions on that aspect?

MR. RENATO LIVINAL:

2685

(Translation) Mme. Chair --

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) You need to introduce yourself.

2690 MR. RENATO LIVINAL:

2695

(Translation) Renato Livinal, I would like to have the map of the 301, if you could bring it up. Three (3) kilometres from Lac Miljour and the village, if it were possible to have an enlargement to see the route that goes by there properly, is it possible to have an enlargement starting from Danford Lake to see the - thank you; no, I would like to have the map that shows the 301, a clearer view of the 301, please.

2700

Mme. Chair, does it work? It doesn't work, really. The 301, Mme. Chair, the 301, at about this level, you can't see very clearly. You can't see the road very clearly, because this doesn't represent the real true curve of the road itself for Highway 301. (End of translation)

2705

Last year, this road actually goes through my property on both sides, both on the north and on the south side of the property. This is - this point, this is where my project, Lac Miljour Estate, is being developed for a variety of years, and the lot locations are on both side of the 301, which are directly on the 301.

In order for us to - and this is a few years back. In order for us to have access to the Mont O'Brien Association to the Lake O'Brien, and the proposed park, we had to have a road in

2710 there, and we had to ask permission to the Ministry of Transport. At that particular point, the road comes down on a hill. It also makes a large curve, which creates a very dangerous situation. So, last fall, sure as to fact, unfortunately, we did have a huge accident which I personally reported to the police.

2715 So, I just wanted to point this out, since we're talking about this, that it's not something that we're dreaming on or guessing at. This has actually occurred. With the increase of a hundred and twenty (120) voyages of trucks, that will definitely increase the accident potentials of that.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2720 (Translation) Thank you; do you have a question? Because you could deal with it in your presentation in the second part.

MR. RENATO LIVINAL:

2725 (Translation) Yes, I will take my place for my question.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2730 (Translation) Yes, thank you. Is that all. Another question for the Ministry of Civil Security.

MR. SHANNON MARTIN:

2735 Yes, this is just a question for the Ministry of Public Security. My name is Shannon Martin. I'm a member of the coalition. We have a cottage on McConnell Lake, which is about two (2) kilometres east of the village of Danford Lake.

2740 Highway 105 is generally known to be one of the most dangerous highways in the province, and the promoter is intending to add many, many, many additional trucks each day to this highway. The Ministry of the Environment has suggested that studies need to be done on the accidents that might be caused by this additional traffic, but the promoter did not do that. I would ask whether or not the Ministry of Public Safety is satisfied with that.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2745 Your question deals with our satisfaction that the proponent has studied the increase accident levels.

MR. SHANNON MARTIN:

2750 My question is whether you're satisfied that the proponent has not studied the increased -
the accidents that might be caused by the additional traffic.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2755 (Translation) I'm uncomfortable in answering your question. I feel that the gentleman's
concern is valuable, and it's crucial even. And I don't think I can speak on behalf of my entire
Ministry. So, I feel that, indeed, it's important that a study be carried out on the issue, because,
indeed, the 105 is a very dangerous road. Quite honestly, I'm not sure if the Ministry of Transport
--

2760

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) I think the question should be posed to the Transport Ministry, and you can
do so tomorrow.

2765

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

(Translation) Because I know that the Transport Ministry has a circumventing project for
the road.

2770

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) A supplementary question?

2775

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chairperson; I think that, definitely, if there is a favourable
decree on the part of the government, LDC will have to meet Transport Ministry, Public Safety,
and all the different stakeholders. I agree with that. That's part of our plans for emergency
2780 measures, but until then, I will let Patrick Gagnon answer the question. He will present statistics
on current accident levels on the 105.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2785

(Translation) Yes, but, listen, there are a lot of people still registered to ask a question.
Could this information be given tomorrow?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2790

(Translation) Yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2795 (Translation) With the people from the Transport Ministry, in their presence, because, you know, time is flying.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2800 (Translation) Yes, we could present that tomorrow. There is a study on the current levels of accidents, and we can present it tomorrow when the Ministry is present.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2805 (Translation) Just give us a reference, so that people can look it up. That satisfies it? Good.

MR. SHANNON MARTIN:

2810 Thank you.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) It's under the Transport Ministry reference.

2815 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) It's part of the documents tabled?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2820 (Translation) No, no, this is new information.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2825 (Translation) Right, we'll deal it tomorrow.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2830 (Translatio) Excuse me, could I ask a question? Am I allowed?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) On the slide?

2835 MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

(Translation) No, on the study, I'd like to know exactly who conducted this study.

2840 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) The study comes from - Patrick will give you the exact reference.

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

2845 (Translation) Good afternoon, Mme. Chairperson, we did conduct a study on accidents thanks to the Outaouais branch of the Transport Ministry. From January 1st, 2002, to December 31st, 2006, I extracted all the accidents involving trucks for all of the accidents that took place, and I can present that tomorrow, but I did look at truck accidents.

2850 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Will you be there tomorrow?

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2855

(Translation) Tomorrow afternoon, yes, I will be there tomorrow afternoon from two (2:00) to four (4:00), but I have a colleague who will fill in for me, if need be.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2860

(Translation) So, we'll continue.

MS. DANIELE MEILLEUR:

2865

(Translation) Could I make another comment? Are there reps of Alleyn-Cawood here? But I would like to promote - no, that's not what I'm trying to say. I'd like to speak to the importance of emergency measures plans and the importance of municipalities to get involved in that. It's important for any type of project that municipalities partake in this type of emergency measure plan, thank you very much.

2870

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2875 (Translation) We'll see you tomorrow. If there are any other questions relating to that topic, we'll deal with them tomorrow. Now, coming back to the registry list, and I would like your cooperation. If there are people who can be part of the Gatineau sessions, please tell us.

2880 Mr. Jean-Marc Boucher, are you here? Will you be able to come to Gatineau tomorrow, tomorrow afternoon, tomorrow evening, or Friday morning? Very well, we'll hear you then, if that's okay with you. Mr. Steve Fowler, is Mr. Steve Fowler still in the room? Mr. Zenon Chmielowski, something to that effect, did you recognize your name? Are you here? No, Mr. Patrick Fowler, is he here?

2885 Mr. Michel Turcot or Turcotte, do you have a question? Did they answer your question? No. General question, will you be coming to Gatineau? Yes, then, we'll expect you there. Gerry Tomley or Tomy, is Mr. Gerry Toomey here? No, Mr. Ken Molyneaux, yes. (The interpreter apologizes. Without the microphone, she cannot hear the question.) I'll be removing it then.

2890 Mr. Ray Thomas, will you be coming to Gatineau? Mr. John Edwards, thank you; Mr. Shannon Martin, will you be in Gatineau? Thank you; Mr. Tracy Molyneaux, do you have other questions to ask? Thank you; Ms. Linda Cronk, will you be at the Gatineau session? You can ask your questions there, thank you. Ms. Cindy Duncan McMillan, she's gone. You'll have to express that again tomorrow. Mr. Pierre-Louis Lafleur; Mr. André Carrière, thank you; Mr. Ed Masotti; Mr. Bob Wilson, you'll be in Gatineau. Ms. Mary Masotti, will you be in Gatineau? Mr. Robert Willis, Wills...

2895

MR. ROBERT WILLS:

No, I can't come tomorrow.

2900

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Then, we call you to the front. Please come ask your questions. If you have any questions, please come forth. You may have more than one, since the register is - we're almost gone through the list, really. We'll hear you out.

2905

MR. ROBERT WILLS:

2910 My name is Robert Wills. I'm not sure to whom the question should be directed. In case something goes not as planned and we discover pollution of the water or the air that was not taken into consideration, who foots the bill? Who is responsible?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2915

(Translation) Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment, and Parks.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2920 (Translation) Mme. Chairperson, I think we've answered that question. There will be a follow-up if something goes wrong - how should I say this - after the project is authorized and that had not been forecasted, because the follow-up is under the proponent's responsibility. He has certain requirements to meet even thirty (30) years after the site is closed. He's responsible for that site for thirty (30) years after the site is shut down until there is no biogas, no pollution, no ground water pollution, or any other type of pollution.

2925 After that period of time, there will be an assessment of the project. And should we not discover any type of nuisance, then the government will remove the responsibility to monitor the site for the proponent, that is.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2930 (Translation) And, in general terms, if a proponent builds equipment or installations, and there is degradation of the environment following that, the Ministry can require from the operator of the site to bring corrective measures.

2935 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2940 (Translation) And if he doesn't do so, the Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment, and Parks can undertake the work and charge the work to the operator.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2945 (Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson, and while the site is operational, the proponent has already paid out an amount of money that is dedicated to repairs. Say, if the operator or the proponent could not do the requirement work, we will use that money. And following that, there is a management fund that lasts three (3) years - thirty (30) years, rather, if not sixty (60). So, that's
2950 a very long and expensive responsibility for the proponent.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2955 (Translation) Does that answer your question?

MR. ROBERT WILLIS:

I would like to ask a related question. Has there been a study to determine how clean the

2960 water, how clean the air is now? And will there be frequent studies to make sure, as we go, that
as soon as anything might happen, that the proper authorities would know about it, that there'll be
no possibility that it would be covered up, that pollution would happen, and the people who live
there, who will be affected by it, would be the last to know?

2965 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Rouleau.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2970 (Translation) I'll let Mr. Poulin answer the question.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2975 (Translation) Indeed, within the follow-up environmental program, the comparison of all
discharge treated in the water, the air, and the effluence that are treated on the surface will be
compared to the background noise that was established during the environmental impact study.

2980 So, in the current document, and that's document PR3.1, all the analyses of the current
situation are found in terms of the quality of the Picanoc River, the quality of the air, the quality of
the underground water. And we've measured noise as well without the trucking.

2985 So, this will be our reference. And during the environmental follow-up, which will be
conducted on a weekly basis for certain parameters and otherwise monthly and, for others, three
(3) times a week - it depends on the area - the results of that environmental follow-up are given to
the surveillance committee. And this is mandatory, and the surveillance committee is comprised
of people who live in the area. And these results are also given to the MRC and the government.
So, there is utter transparency to compare the situation that is currently seen and the one that will
happen during the operation of the site.

2990 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And this afternoon, Mr. Rouleau, you took the commitment to put the results
on the web site.

2995 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Yes.

MR. ROBERT WILLS:

3000 Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3005 (Translation) Ms. Mary Lee de Lombard, are you still here? Thank you; Ms. Priscilla Latimer.

MS. PRISCILLA LATIMER:

3010 My name is Priscilla Latimer from Danford Lake, and my question is: Is there anyone here this evening who would possibly have figures on how much it might cost us in our municipality to ship garbage to Lachute, if that became necessary?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3015 (Translation) Very well, because if the technical landfill site is not approved and implemented, what does that involve in terms of costs for your municipality or for the average taxpayer?

3020 MS. PRISCILLA LATIMER:

Yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3025 (Translation) There is nobody from the municipality here?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3030 (Translation) Currently, municipalities were obliged to start closing their dumps, because they had reached their maximum capacity. And they've gone through the very painful experience to transfer and transport their waste to Lachute, and that is through the Wakefield transfer centre.

3035 So, the costs that were quoted so far would have to be verified with those municipalities, because we didn't see them in writing. So, this is tentative, but we're talking about, currently, for the municipalities that use dumping trenches, you'll understand that it's very low costs, five (\$5.00) to ten dollars (\$10.00) a ton, because it's done with pick-ups or small trucks, and it's buried in the trench. So, the costs are very low.

3040 Once the waste has to be transferred to the centre in Wakefield and then transferred again to Lachute, the price rises to a hundred eighty (\$180.00) to two hundred dollars (\$200.00) a ton. So, we're talking about a very substantial increase, eight (8) to ten (10) times the cost

we've currently been quoted. That's what we've been told, but we haven't been able to find that in writing. Perhaps we could undertake to find the information for you, Mme. Chairperson.

3045

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And per dwelling, how much does that mean?

3050

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) If we look at the current disposal rates per person, per capita, that we have in our impact study, the figure comes to point seventy-five (.75) tons per person per year. Each person produces about one point two (1.2) to one point five (1.5) tons of waste, but there is recycling. There is reclamation. There is reduction, etc.

3055

After all of those factors taken into account, we come to point seventy-five (.75) per person per year. If we consider that there are two (2) to three (3) people living under the - in the same dwelling, we'll say three (3) --

3060

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Normally, it's two point two (2.2).

3065

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) We'll take two (2) then. So, two (2) times point seventy-five (.75) brings us to, say, one point five (1.5) tons per dwelling times eighty (80), we'll say, so we don't exaggerate the costs. That would mean about a hundred twenty dollars (\$120.00) per family. That's how much the income tax would increase, a hundred twenty (\$120.00) to a hundred fifty (\$150.00).

3070

MS. PRISCILLA LATIMER:

Thank you.

3075

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Mr. Rouleau --

3080

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) A supplementary answer, go ahead.

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

3085

(Translation) Patrick Laliberté, Des Collines MRC, the figures you don't have perhaps I could provide to you, because I manage the transshipping centre that was mentioned earlier. The cost we charge to the municipalities that are outside of our area, of our MRC, is about seventy (\$70.00) to seventy-two dollars (\$72.00) per ton.

3090

This is based on the price we established in our former agreement, which will come to an end at the end of 2008. For Gatineau, it's July. And for us, it will be the end of 2008. And those burial rates are based on thirty dollars (\$30.00) a ton for burial only. You have to add an extra twenty dollars (\$20.00) for shipping and extra cost for the building of the transshipment centre, plus the ten dollars (\$10.00) of fees, which brings us to about seventy-two dollars (\$72.00).

3095

Current pricing for burial on the market revolve around fifty (\$50.00) to sixty dollars (\$60.00) a ton for new contracts. So, we can imagine that, after 2008, there will be an extra twenty dollars (\$20.00) to add to burial. So, our seventy-two (\$72.00) would rise to about ninety-two dollars (\$92.00) based solely on current figures. So, we could say that eighty (\$80.00) to a hundred dollars (\$100.00) is pretty much accurate.

3100

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3105

(Translation) Pardon me, Mr. Labrie; with all due respect, I would also add the price of coming from Danford Lake to Wakefield. That shipping cost would be added to your ninety dollar (\$90.00) figure. So, for the municipality of Danford Lake, they will have to ship the waste to Wakefield.

3110

If we look at a truck that ships seven (7) tons, the time required to ship waste from Danford Lake to Wakefield, that's about any hour there and back, perhaps a little bit more, but we'll say an hour, an hour, an hour to an hour and a half. That's about a hundred dollars (\$100.00) for the truck.

3115

A hundred dollars (\$100.00) divided by seven (7) tons, that means about twelve dollars (\$12.00). So, twelve (\$12.00) plus ninety-two (\$92.00) brings us to about one hundred dollars (\$100.00) a ton. A hundred dollars (\$100.00) multiplied by the one point five (1.5) that we established earlier, that would mean about a hundred fifty dollars (\$150.00) a ton. So, we are, in fact, accurate, more or less. Thank you, Mr. Labrie.

3120

THE COMMISSIONER:

3125

(Translation) So, the alternative solution would cost about a hundred fifty dollars (\$150.00), a hundred (\$100.00) to a hundred fifty dollars (\$150.00) for the waste to be shipped to Lachute. And what kind of economies of scale would result from the technical landfill site in

Danford Lake?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

3130 (Translation) For Alleyn-and-Cawood specifically, Mr. Commissioner, nothing, it wouldn't cost them anything. The agreement with the municipality establishes that so long as there are efforts made in recycling and reuse, etc., so we not encourage burial, burial would be free. The agreement provides for zero dollars a ton for the residents.

3135 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) But for us to understand what a comparable cost would be, if I take Kazabazua, which is the neighbouring municipality, that benefit doesn't apply. It doesn't apply to Kazabazua, does it? And what would be the cost for one ton of waste to be treated at your TLS?
3140 We're not looking for a price, but we're looking at a ballpark figure.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) If you look at the major clients, everybody is looking for Gatineau, because
3145 they have much more waste, but we're looking at twenty-five (\$25.00) to sixty-five dollars (\$65.00), depending on the size of the client and the tonnage already a part of the site. So, that's the scale we're looking at, unless there is more costs.

THE COMMISSIONER:

3150 (Translation) Including transportation or shipment?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

3155 (Translation) No, shipment isn't included, but if you look at Kazabazua, which is a neighbouring municipality, we're looking at about fifteen (15), twenty (20) minutes. It's just a few dollars per shipped ton. If we look at Gatineau that uses a transshipment centre, the trucks are heavier vehicles. We're looking at ten (\$10.00) to fifteen dollars (\$15.00) a ton per shipment.

3160 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3165 (Translation) Mr. Gilles Pelletier, will you be in Gatineau? We'll hear your question then.

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

3170 (Translation) Good evening to all, my name is Gilles Pelletier, and my question is as follows. Where on the Picanoc River shore will you have the leach discharge?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3175 (Translation) Since you're talking about a particular site, could Mr. Rouleau provide us with a more precise map with regard to the location of the TLS? We would like to see the river, and we would also like to see the cottages or residences, dwellings, call them what you wish, but the areas where people live or go on holidays within a four (4) kilometre radius. And we would like them to be broken down between radius 4, 3, 2, and 1. That's about it, and the location where
3180 the effluent would be discharged. Would it be possible to get that?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson.
3185

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) When?

3190 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) That's what I'm trying to figure out. Since the municipality's D.G. is with us, and since we're all here, it's very difficult to prepare that during the day to come, but perhaps we could do it in the next - or the coming week. Would that be adequate?
3195

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do whatever you can.

3200 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) As early as possible, as for the answer regarding where's the point of the effluent, we can give that right away, but for the exact location of the cottages, we'll do what we can for one (1), two (2), three (3), and four (4) kilometres. You asked for a radius of four (4)
3205 kilometres.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Yes, if you could show the map with a four (4) kilometre radius.
3210

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Yes, but do you want the cottages up to four (4) kilometres of distance?

3215 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Along the river.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3220

(Translation) Up to four (4) kilometres away? Because you understand, Mme. Chair, that if it's within a two (2) kilometre radius, we can give it tomorrow, because we did the impact study for a two (2) kilometre radius.

3225 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Provide, first of all, the two (2) kilometres, okay, and when you're able to provide information on the four (4) kilometre radius, primarily downstream to see the zone of effluence along the river.

3230

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Yes, I understand your idea. It's not all the cottages --

3235 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Not the entire four (4) kilometre perimeter, for two (2) kilometres we want to know what kind of dwellings there are, but within a four (4) kilometre radius with regard to cottages along the river.

3240

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Yes, we'll show where the effluent, preliminary effluent, will be, because we still haven't drawn up the plans and the estimates, but that will give us an idea of where the point of discharge is.

3245

On page 25 of the document PR5.1, the answers to your questions and comments, we show the location of the discharge site for distribution of waters and the ditch for waters on page 25 then of the document PR5.1.

3250

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Did you have a question while you wait?

3255 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) That's unusual that they ask for that.

3260 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) I'd like to know --

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3265 (Translation) No, too late; if I remember correctly, Mme. Chair, the cottage was - here, obviously, the angle - maybe Mr. Pelletier could show us. Should I go up that way?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

3270 (Translation) Hang on a second.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3275 (Translation) First of all, you can see that the Picanoc River goes up this way, and then it creates a sort of a bay almost, a triangle here. If I remember correctly, it seems that you were up there somewhere around five hundred (500) to eight hundred (800) metres downstream.

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

3280 (Translation) Do I understand that your discharge will go pretty much directly into the Groove Creek, into Groove Creek?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3285 (Translation) No, this is an underground conduit, which goes up to the river. So, we don't - there's a dish for surface water. We're not talking about the treated waters. We have an underground conduit which goes up to here. Here, you have - it goes somewhat like this.

3290 So, that means that, during the break, we assess, Mme. Chair, what the rate of dilution would be once it gets to this point. And according to our calculations, which are sort of on the corner of the table here, we'd have to do them based on our environmental discharge objectives. The dilution at that distance would mean that the Picanoc River would be at the same level of concentration that it is right now.

3295 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The place you're proposing for discharge, it seems narrower.

3300 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) So, the rate of flow of the river is higher.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3305 (Translation) So, at that point, the dilution, the mix, you chose that spot for a faster mix?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3310 (Translation) With better turbulence and better mix, because there's a higher rate of flow, a higher rate of fluidity, it's in rapids. So, that allows for better dilution, a better mix.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3315 (Translation) And you took this water sample to establish the quality of the river beforehand?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Yes.

3320

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And is that with the public health plan? In terms of water consumption, is that acceptable? We know that there are bacteria.

3325

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, I'm not the person who can tell you, but I think that Mme. Lachapelle yesterday, who talked about this, would be much better to speak to it.

3330

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Has she seen the results?

3335 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Yes, she has, and she's very well aware of the criteria for surface water and the criteria for potable water. What we know is that we compared the water, and the quality of the water is very good.

3340

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Yes, we won't go any further for the moment, but what's important is that we'll ask the Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment, and the Parks to provide a written response, if the time allows during the week. Well, we have tomorrow and Friday morning left, but we'll ask them to tell us their assessment of the potability of the water once the effluent is in the river, what that will imply. The residents who go and get water at the river, will they have to look for another source of water?

3345

3350

Do you have an immediate reply? At the mike, please. Tell us what you would need in order to tell us whether, effectively, that would change significantly the quality of the water or not.

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

3355

(Translation) The question is whether the water would be potable, if the citizen drew water out of the river after the discharge of the leachate water. It depends where they take it. If they take it underneath the pipe, which is something we generally don't see, there's a certain dilution necessary before the river recovers its basic constitution, if you will.

3360

But the regulatory standards are severe enough at this point that if they're respected, and here I'm not talking about objectives in terms of discharge, which is another subject, but the standards are severe enough that the water, once it's treated, is very clean in terms of coliform bacteria and matter in suspension and in terms of DBO, in terms of pH, etc.

3365

But there's no doubt that - my colleague will confirm it, but, in a general way, I mean we don't tell people to go and draw water from the river, because, in natural form, anyway, there are coliform bacteria in a river. That's why people who live in more isolated regions have underground wells or they boil their water, because there are coliform bacteria that occur naturally, even if it's a virgin area that's not touched with discharges of any sorts.

3370

So, when we calculated the objectives for discharge, we stipulated that, as far as we know, there is no source of potable water downstream that is in the Picanoc or in the Gatineau Rivers.

3375

And even on the most recent map that we found, you might have to look at a more exact

twenty (20) to twenty (20) to one thousand (1,000) level card, map, that is, we don't see the cottage, but we were quite surprised to find out. If we had to redraw objectives of discharge with regard to the utilization for water, I don't think that would change our objectives in terms of discharge, but the exercise would have to be carried out.

3380

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Very well, and we understand that you don't recommend straight away that people take water from the river, anyway, whatever river, even if they were, apparently, very high quality. That's what I understood, if possible, or at least you recommend that water be boiled?

3385

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

(Translation) I'll pass the mike over to Monique Beauchamps with whom I work, who is more familiar with those matters, because she often deals with municipal problems.

3390

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Alright.

3395

MS. MONIQUE BEAUCHAMPS:

(Translation) The important parameter to consider generally, when it's a question of potable water, is that of bacteria, so, a faecal coliform bacteria. Unfortunately, in nature, there are faecal coliform bacteria. For water to be considered potable, there must not be any faecal coliform bacteria. That's why there's a regulation that was adopted to - for potable water distribution networks. That water must be free of faecal coliform bacteria.

3400

There are only two (2) possibilities. Either you treat the water or you take water from underground, but, at surface water, you cannot know that there won't be any faecal coliform present. So, surface water from a river is always risky up to a certain point. I mean you might be in a very perfectly natural spot, but you don't know when an animal might provide you faecal coliform bacteria. I mean that happens with warm-blooded animals, and there are chances that there might be. You may not find some as well.

3405

But when Carole talked about the regulation earlier, she was talking about the regulation on sanitary landfill sites. And the standard required by the regulation is a maximum of - an average of one hundred (100) faecal coliform per hundred (100) millilitres, which is relatively severe.

3415

And with the distribution that's found in the river, I won't say go ahead and make potable

water out of it. I won't go to that point, but we're talking about criteria of water for baths, which is a maximum of two hundred (200) faecal coliform bacteria per hundred (100) litres.

3420 To reach that level for river water, respecting the criteria for bath water, I mean, or wash water, is higher or looser, that is, than for potable water. I mean you don't swallow industrial quantities. You immerse your head, your eyes, your hands. So, there's a possibility of infection, but the criterion for that reason is higher than for potable water. In the case of potable water, it is zero.

3425

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Very well, at what distance from the point of discharge would you recommend not to draw water from the river?

3430

MS. MONIQUE BEAUCHAMP:

(Translation) I don't recommend drawing water from any river, no, never, but the lady did say that - I mean when you're using water for potable purposes, you always have to have that analyzed. That's a basic precaution that has nothing to do with the establishment of a sanitary landfill site or whatever it may be.

3435

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) Alright, we've gone a fair little ways here, and what I wanted to conclude was the average depth of the water at its lowest level starting from the discharge site for what? Five hundred (500) metres perhaps or...

3440

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3445

(Translation) While you're looking for --

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

(Translation) Oh, we found it, Mme. Chair. We submitted that information in the form of a table in the response document, which is PR5.1 on page 24. We indicated in that document that the depth of water from the surface - we're talking about two (2) feet or zero point six (0.6) metres - that was the information we had - which, I believe, is used by people from the Ministry to calculate the ministerial requirements.

3450

3455

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Is that alright? Is what you needed?

3460 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) So, you're saying that the river is really very shallow at that place, two (2) feet.

3465 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) What we said was that the bottom of the pipe would be installed two (2) feet below the surface, but the deepest point of the river, in the middle, we don't know. It hasn't been plumbed.

3470

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Okay, I'm going to stop you there. The interpreters must leave in a few moments. We have four (4) people who are still registered. I will call their names to see if they can come to Gatineau; Mr. Molyneaux, Scott, okay; Mr. Jean-Marc Boucher; Mr. Michel Turcot; Mme. Michèle Borchers, very well.

3475

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) Just a very small thing, Madam, the water at that place in the summer, when you go through with a boat, you have to raise the motor, because it's too shallow. That's all I wanted to say. I don't know if that changes anything, but...

3480

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Okay, thank you; there's one person remaining this evening, Mr. Molyneaux, Scott.

3485

MR. SCOTT MOLYNEAUX:

My name is Scott Molyneaux. I'm an aboriginal, aboriginal. I have my aboriginal status. I practise my rights of the constitution, Canada Constitution Act 1982, if any of you are aware of that. I have a question for the environment, Ministry of Environment.

3490

I practise my rights in this area of where the landfill site is going to be. I'm building a camp there next week. So, there's another camp on this land. This is Crown land. This is my land. I'm building a camp there next week to practise my rights. And I'd like to know if the Ministry of Environment was in to visit the site where they have the wood, the lumber, the timber on the land.

3495

3500 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Yes, Mme. Chair, when we visited, yes, of course, there was.

3505 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do you have the transcription?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

3510 (Translation) Yes, Mme. Chair, when we visited the site, yes, we noted that there were a lot of trees that had been cut.

MR. SCOTT MOLYNEAUX:

3515 (Translation) What are you going to do about all the timber that has been cut close to the Picanoc River? It has been cut up to like thirty (30) feet from the river, twenty (20) feet at the high water level mark. I hunt and I fish in this area. I practise my rights under the Canada Constitution Act 1982, and this is affecting me. I'd like to know what is going to be done about this.

3520 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) That's the last question for this evening.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

3525 (Translation) Mme. Chair, I would like the promoter to answer this question, because I have only visited it once.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3530 (Translation) Very quickly, very quickly.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

3535 (Translation) Presently, the proponent is not the owner of the site. It belongs to the public Crown. There is a concession that was granted to Louisiana Pacific. They're the ones who cut the wood. They may have gone too close and not respected the cut plan to reserve the buffer zone up to the River Picanoc, but the proponent has no responsibility for the cut of wood that took place. Unfortunately, it took place close to the Picanoc River.

3540

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3545 (Translation) Very well, we will have to end for this evening, because the interpreters have already given us three (3) minutes extra, thank you very much. We will continue tomorrow starting at two o'clock (2:00) at Gatineau. I know that a number of you will be there. Thank you; we will carry on at Gatineau. And as you know, we will come back for the second part of the public hearings, in which you will be able to intervene with memoranda or a verbal - oral presentations. Thank you very much for your presentations here and for your presence.

3550

3555 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.

AND I HAVE SIGNED:

3560

ANNAGRET RINALDI,
Official Court Reporter.