

**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 5

Hearing held May 17, 2007, 19 h
Cathédrale Saint-Jean-Marie-Vianney
160, rue Bruchési
Gatineau

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PERIOD :

STEVE FOWLER	10
ZENON CHMIELOWSKI	24
PATRICK FOWLER.....	27
MICHEL TURCOT	30
GEORGE McCORMICK.....	33
RECESS.....	37
SHANNON MARTIN.....	40
LINDA CRONK.....	51
ANDRÉ CARRIÈRE	53
PAUL DINGLEDINE	58
GILLES PELLETIER.....	63
STEPHANIE MILFORD	65

MS. CLAUDETTE JOURNAULT,
THE CHAIRWOMAN:

5

(Translation) Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to this public hearing. We'll be dealing, of course, with the creation of a technical landfill site in Danford Lake in Alleyn-and-Cawood.

10

So, then, the way we do things is that we have a register. It is now open. You must put in your name to be in a position to ask questions. Every time that you register and that your name is called, you can come to the intervener's table at the fore, and the question that you ask must be addressed to me, one question per participant at a time. If you have any further questions, you are asked to please register once again. The commission will be directing the questions either to the

15

There are many organizations here with us once again, including the Ministry of Transportation, Health & Social Services, RCM's, regional county municipalities, that is, the Ministry of Sustainable Development, the Environment, and Parks, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife or Fauna.

20

Is there a spokesperson for the Municipality of Alleyn-and-Cawood in the hall this evening? Yes, there is? Yes or no? We're not all together sure, yes; the regional county municipality, Vallée-de-la-Gatineau, Pontiac RCM now, Collines-de-l'Outaouais RCM, the City of Gatineau. It won't be long. They'll be here very soon, no doubt.

25

Without further ado then, we'll start our proceedings with a series of questions that had been addressed to the commission in writing. I will ask the Commissioner to tell us what these questions are.

30

MR. DONALD LABRIE,
THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) On behalf of Ms. Helen Thompson, who was not to be here, couldn't apparently be here, I have a series of questions then. I'll be summarizing the preamble that she wrote. So, this morning, and the date for this fax, I believe, was the day before yesterday. So, Routes 301 and 105, on a thirty (30) minute period, she counted a hundred and - or twenty-eight (28) trucks out of one oh five (105). At any rate, she's wondering, given that these trucking routes have been designated as trucking routes, is there a limit as to the number of trucks that can ride on these roads?

40

MR. JACQUES HENRY:

45 (Translation) To answer your questions in this regard, there is no limit per se in terms of the number of trucks. The Ministry, and this is part of its mission, must make sure that people and merchandise can move around on its roads network in a way that is safe.

50 So, there is no limit per se, but we do know, however, that we carry out analyses in terms of the roads' capacity and what is the maximum capacity for different roads. And there are different factors in analyzing a road's capacity. And once this is done, letters are attributed A to F. F is a route with a lot of traffic, and A is very fluid. And based on our analyses for 105 and mostly the 101, there is no major problem here with congestion.

55 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Now, a question that might be answered by Mr. Rouleau. So, she questions this number of a hundred and twenty-two (122) trucks that go by or the number of transits. So, how many private transits do you expect? Is this included in your figure of one hundred and twenty-two (122)?

60 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) I'll give the floor to Patrick Gagnon.

65 MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

(Translation) Good evening, Mr. Commissioner, as to the hundred and twenty-two (122) transits, that was based on maximum tonnage. So, if you're talking about long term and maximum tonnage, as we try and study not the worst-case scenario, not exactly, but the most unfavourable case, in other words, maximum tonnage for this number of trucks, and this is what was used to come to the conclusion that we had one hundred and twenty-two (122).

70 We also used trucks coming from the transfer centre that are already being used by the City of Gatineau for material coming from that region. So, we used the same approach or the same kind of analysis for the waste that would be coming over here, at maximum tonnage, which gives us a hundred and twenty-two (122) for the 301.

75 THE COMMISSIONER:

80 (Translation) A question addressed to the City of Gatineau now, we'll be listening to the City of Gatineau spokesperson. Now, during the spring thaw, when there's a maximum weight, is this - can this number of trucks be double what is it normally? I believe you've already answered this question, but you might want to delve into this again briefly.

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

85

(Translation) Yes, Mr. Commissioner, now, for some of the trucks, maximum load must be brought down, must be reduced. I believe that, for the seven (7) ton garbage trucks, what is admissible during the spring thaw - and we're talking about they don't go above the maximum. It's only for larger trucks that there may be a problem. So, there's a maximum load that is different during the spring thaw, but this doesn't mean that there will be twice the number of trucks driving there, but it limits the load that these trucks can actually carry.

90

THE COMMISSIONER:

95

(Translation) Do you confirm this answer, this data, sir?

MR. JACQUES HENRY:

100

(Translation) I don't have detailed information in terms of the excess loads depending on the types of trucks and so forth. What we know is that the different vehicles, they do have limits in terms of their load. And when it's the thaw, it has to be half load. As to the way that the proponent will manage this situation, well, it's up to him, insofar as he does abide by the rules and the road safety rules. And this is up to the SAAQ, of course.

105

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) So, probably they would - there would be no excess load.

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

110

(Translation) Initially, it's up to the shipper. We're not the shippers of these wastes. So, we're simply the operators of the landfill site. However...

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

115

(Translation) Given the fact that it depends on the number of axles, but there's also the issue of the density of the waste that is carried.

120

So, if it's a full load of this kind of waste in a truck, well, the truck might not even reach the allowable, the admissible maximum load. They read the maximum volume before they reach the maximum load. So, it's low mass, relatively speaking. So, because they don't reach the maximum load initially, there might be, I mean, a reduction of the load, but it wouldn't be half as much.

125 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Something else now, the proponent mentioned that this would be done during office hours, week days. Is this a legislation or an obligation imposed on --

130 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) It's an engagement on the part of LDC. It's a commitment on our part.

THE COMMISSIONER:

135 (Translation) Now, a question dealing with these two (2) roads, the 301 and 105: Do you expect to be repairing the roads and making them four (4) laners to accommodate this larger volume of traffic?

140 MR. JACQUES HENRY:

(Translation) Well, where planning is concerned, first of all, on Route 301, we don't expect to be doing anything in this regard. We've already mentioned that traffic flows on the 301 are quite limited. It's low traffic. So, on the 301, there's nothing that we expect to be doing.

145 As for the 105 now, we do expect to do certain things. This is part of our five (5) year planning, if you will. We do know that the part, you know, between the end of the present highway in Wakefield and on the other side of Wakefield where there's a junction to the 105, we expect to turn all of this into highway.

150 The Ministry, both federal and provincial, of Transportation have announced that the works would be initiated as of this summer for two point five (2.5) kilometres initially as of the end of the highway. Then, there'll still be six point five (6.5) kilometres to get to Wakefield. And in this respect, the Ministers have committed to prepare the calls for tenders and the plans to go ahead with the work, but no specific date has been set.

155 Now, beyond Wakefield, certain things are expected. Specifically, this summer, around Farrelton, we'll be having a road around Farrelton, but we don't expect to go to four (4) laners past Wakefield. The Ministry has paved the shoulders along 105. That has been done over the past few years.

160 What still needs to be done is to improve things, because certain curves are tighter around Farrelton specifically, Brennan's Hill as well, and Alcove. We will be doing some work over there, but these matters are now being studied. And the road will still be two (2) lanes with an opportunity for a third lane to pass every once in a while. that's north of Wakefield. South of Wakefield, we're
165 talking about a highway.

THE COMMISSIONER:

170 (Translation) A question on behalf of the commission now, the 301 from Kazabazua to the site, we've noticed that the pavement was damaged. It's in a very bad state at times. Do you expect to be improving the situation? And also the shoulders have not been paved, and the trucks driving there create a lot of dust. You get clouds of dust when the trucks drive by. This is what we saw. Do you expect to be improving this situation on that part of the road?

175 MR. JACQUES HENRY:

(Translation) Well, as for the 301, there is a project. This is part of our five (5) year plan. As to the number of years required, well, it depends on the money, the credits, given by the Ministry, because a lot of work needs to be done, as you know, but, from Kazabazua to Danford
180 Lake, this is part of our plan.

As for paving the shoulders now, we did not consider this, not yet anyway, but when we work on this project later on, I imagine we could look into this.

185 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Especially on the portion where there will be a larger number of trucks; I'd like to come back now to Ms. Thompson's questions. The weighing station or the control station that is mentioned in the impact assessment study, and I'm talking about trucks that we might have to
190 monitor because of radiological material or radioactive material. So, there's a radiological measurement that is taken to see whether or not there is radioactive material or waste in the truck. So, how will you be doing things? What will you be doing to detect this kind of situation, if you suspect that there is radioactive waste in a truck?

195 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Thank you, Mr. Commissioner; I'll give the floor to Mr. Yves Gagnon.

MR. YVES GAGNON:

200 (Translation) Yes, Mr. Commissioner, on this issue now, generally, what is done is that specialty equipment is set up on either side of the scale, and the main function of this equipment is to detect in the load of a given truck the presence of radioactive waste. So, this is Section 38 of the new regulation that requires this to be done in all of the new landfill sites, technical landfill sites,
205 that is.

So, I'm not really a specialist on this issue, but apparently the legislators have come to

210 the conclusion that once in a while there is, for instance, a situation where people go to tests to detect cancer, for instance, and so, sometimes there is radioactive material, which needs to be detected. And this kind of residual waste has to be detected, and this is why the government has decided to do this.

THE COMMISSIONER:

215 (Translation) Will this be done systematically on all the trucks?

MR. YVES GAGNON:

220 (Translation) Yes, absolutely, all of the loads, no exceptions, they will all go onto the scale, and they will be checked for the presence of radioactive material.

THE COMMISSIONER:

225 (Translation) What do you do when you do detect radioactive waste or radioactive substance?

MR. YVES GAGNON:

230 (Translation) Well, there are different procedures that are a part of our way of doing things. It depends on what we're talking about. I mean we might be contacting the Canadian Nuclear Safety people in Laval. I believe they're in Laval.

235 So, first of all, well, the Ministry of Environment will be contacted at their original office here in the Outaouais. And, afterwards, we'll be acting jointly with the representatives of this Ministry, deciding whether or not to contact the Canadian Nuclear Safety people and what can be done with this kind of material. There might be different situations, depending on what we're talking about.

THE COMMISSIONER:

240 (Translation) At any rate, the truck will be set aside and will have to wait there, parked there.

MR. YVES GAGNON:

245 (Translation) Oh, yes, absolutely.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You'll be waiting for instructions.

250

MR. YVES GAGNON:

(Translation) Yes, we will.

255

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) One last question now, if the project were approved, would the coalition or other groups or other citizens be in a position to visit the site to see what's going on, or will there be limits to accessing this site?

260

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Well, on many occasions, I think we've mentioned that a vigilance committee will be created, will be set up, and I think the transcripts do show that the vigilance committee is the ideal instrument to ensure that there is transparency. They can go and visit the site. They can look into everything, do follow-up control, what have you, and check on what the proponent is doing, and look at the data provided by the Ministry of the Environment.

265

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

270

(Translation) Well, right now, there is no vigilance committee.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

275

(Translation) Well, I believe that right now - it wasn't quite the right word. I mean it's mostly an environmental follow-up committee, so to speak, that was struck in order to make sure that the process was, inasmuch as possible, that everything was done jointly. It's not really a vigilance committee, the way that this is defined in the regulations.

280

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) So, that's it for Ms. Thompson's questions. I've another question now as per security at the intersection of the 301 and the access to the site. So, you get on average, depending on when you measure, a hundred and sixty-two (162) trucks a day, and we'll be adding a hundred and twenty-two (122) that will be, so, entering and leaving the site, if the project goes ahead, of course. So, might this be - might this create a problem with road safety, and has anything been done or did you think about making the road larger there?

285

MR. JACQUES HENRY:

290

(Translation) Well, if the proponent gets an okay, gets a green light, he'll have to ask a

295 permit to the Ministry to provide access to the road. And as we've already mentioned in our comments, generally, we ask a proponent to provide us with safety analysis and a detailed analysis of the traffic at the - well, not just the intersection, but the access to the site, in fact, and we ask him to look into a number of issues such as visibility. When the vehicles go out of the site, is visibility good both ways?

300 So, the proponent can set up his access wherever he wishes on his lot, but he must meet certain requirements which are the standards set out by the Ministry. If it is required to do any work, to provide additional lanes, well, usually, the proponent would have to pay for this. So, we do require that he produce a detailed analysis of the traffic, and that he deal with security issues or safety issues.

305 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) How would you - what would your design be for that intersection, Mr. Rouleau?

310 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) I'll give the floor to Patrick Gagnon, Mr. Commissioner.

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

315 (Translation) Mr. Commissioner, as was explained by the spokesperson of the Ministry of Transportation, in engineering, we have standards and criteria when we do this kind of design. All these criteria were written by the Ministry of Transportation. You may need extra lanes, you know, the ability to turn left. So, when everything is set up finally, we submit the project to the Ministry of Transportation to make sure that we are in line with their requirements. And every specific project
320 is examined on a case-per-case basis. So, we will be making sure that access does comply with the requirements of the Ministry, access to the left, visibility, stop sign, what have you, everything that we find in the engineering books, if you will.

325 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) There might be specific signalling indicating that trucks will be driving out.

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

330 (Translation) Yes, absolutely, the entrance to the site must be advertised, so to speak, thanks to a sign before people get to the site. There might be special signalling, by the way, special panels with yellow lights indicating that trucks are coming in and out. So, it's a case-by-case basis, and we have to comply with what the Ministry of Transportation spells out, and we

335 need to make sure that we do so. Everything is quite clearly spelled out, depending on the number of trucks and so forth.

THE COMMISSIONER:

340 (Translation) Do you have anything else to add?

MR. JACQUES HENRY:

345 (Translation) No, nothing more, it's up to the proponent to submit to us his analysis and the basic concept, as he tries to prepare for this work for his access to his site. And we will then be analyzing it, and if need, we'll be communicating with the proponent to tell him to change things, if need be.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

350 (Translation) Before we go on with other matters, is there any additional information that you might provide at this point in time, any document that you would wish to table, either you the proponent or the resource persons? Is everything okay?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

355 (Translation) We've nothing to add.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

360 (Translation) Alright, the resource persons, nothing more? Alright.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

365 (Translation) Pardon me, Mme. Chair, I have received information about the number of trucks for the other two (2) sites. I'll be tabling these documents at the back of the room here.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

370 (Translation) Is Mr. Steve Conolly here? Conolly is it? Is the gentleman here? No, Mr. Jean-Marc Boucher?

MR. JEAN-MARC BOUCHER:

375 (Translation) Mme. Chair, my name is Jean-Marc Boucher. My question was actually asked this afternoon. So, I'm okay.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you; Mr. Steve Fowler.

380

MR. STEVE FOWLER:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, thank you for giving me time and an opportunity to speak here this evening. My name is Steve Fowler. And over the past eighteen (18) years, I've been an owner at Lake McAuley in Kazabazua not very far from the site that we're talking about here.(End of translation)

385

So, first of all, let me say that I am very impressed with this whole BAPE process, the whole public disclosure and these kind of meetings, and particularly the very distinguished and qualified people from the various departments of the government that are here, and that I am sure that, you know, with this help, this would be a huge help for the Gatineau region to come up with the right solution for waste management for the whole Outaouais region, but we all know that that's not why we're here.

390

We're here to discuss only one thing, which is a technical landfill site at only one location from only one service provider, right. Now, don't get me wrong. If the true need is defined that we need a technical landfill site, I have no doubt that LDC can provide the solution. What I need to understand is, you know, how do we get this far and why is LDC here?

395

Now, in their presentation, they mention that I think it was in 2004, as far as they are concerned, the process started with them contacting the City of Allevyn-and-Cawood, but, in my view, there must have been a lot that happened before that, right.

400

Because if I understand the process that has been explained to here now through this process is that the MRC - each of the regions of the MRC need to have a waste management plan. They should all get together, agree on what's best for the region. Once they have that plan, they would then know, first of all, do we need a technical landfill site or some other solution.

405

If we do, they would have measured how much the quantity and determine how big it has to be. Then, they would do a site selection process. Then, they would come up with specifications and design. I assume, with public money, they would go through a - you know, a tendering process, a selection process, and they would eventually award to the best in class provider. It could be LDC or Laidlaw or someone like that. And then, this whole BAPE process would start, if I understand it, right.

410

So, here we are, and my question is - I guess it has taken me a long time to get there, but the question is this. Did all that process happen, and is LDC here as the result of successfully

415

420 winning that bidding process based on a clearly defined need, a clearly defined process, you know? And so, are they bringing a solution that was asked for in a competitive way, or is it, in a word, unsolicited, non-prévu, non-demandé? They bring a solution to the table for which there is no question, and yet that kicks off this whole BAPE process and disclosure process and so on.

425 So, fine, if the whole process went through and LDC is here having followed all that process, then, fine, let's continue. If that process didn't happen either because the MRC's don't have their plans, they don't really know if they want a technical landfill, then my question is this. I mean why are we proceeding? Because, you know, it's not definite that anyone wants a technical landfill. They don't know how big it needs to be, and there's no competitive process for us to know this is the best service provider.

430 So, which is it? Is it unsolicited, off the table, out of the blue, or does it come through a complete process? What happened? That's what I want to know.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

435 (Translation) We'll be asking the question from the Pontiac MRC first.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

440 (Translation) As you know, Mme. Chairperson, all MRC's in Quebec had to develop a waste management plan to meet Quebec's 1998/2008 policy. We went through the exercise and looked at the problem that poses all of waste management, especially at home. And in our case, in order to meet the requirements of this policy, we had to find alternatives to the disposal of waste matter. We used dumping entrenches, and that's all we use, and we're found today with a regulation that says that those have to be shut down by January, 2009.

445 So, we began reflecting on it, when we began developing our waste management plan. So, this goes as far as 2000, 2001, if not before, because I would remind you that when we reviewed our development plan, which is in place and have been for the past six (6) years, we already had that concern here at home. So, it has been quite a few years.

450 When we had to develop that waste management plan, we said we will have to some day broach that topic of waste management or what alternatives we have. That's when we thought about plasma gasification. We spoke to this recently. We looked at all the alternatives, but, at the end of the day, we had to be realistic. And, currently, we feel that technical landfill sites are the solution.

455 It was in our interest to try and find a solution here at home because of what is set out in Quebec's regulations. So, I would say that the process started up to seven (7) or eight (8) years ago.

460

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And the other part of the question: Why is it a private proponent? Was there a call for tender?

465

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) This is the first proponent that came to the municipality. At first, we were not involved at great length in the file until 2005, that is, because, at that point, we understood how big the problem was. Beforehand, we were conscientious of the problem, but we were procrastinating a little, I suppose.

470

And that's why when the proponent came to us, we felt we had to take it into consideration. He was the only person who presented a plan to eliminate waste matter. Being the only one, there was no alternative. Had there been another proponent, a second or third proponent, with another alternative, then obviously we would have considered it as well, but, unfortunately, he is the only person who came to us with this proposal.

475

And we considered the alternative. And, currently, what I can say is that there pretty much are no other alternatives, because we've come to the end of a time line that is set out in the regulations. And, obviously, we would have envisaged other alternatives, if other private proponents had come to us.

480

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

485

(Translation) There was no review of possible private/public partnerships?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Of late, we considered the situation, but we felt that - I must say that the Pontiac MRC only has fourteen thousand five hundred (14,500) people living on thirteen thousand eight hundred (13,800) square kilometres, which is huge, and a very small population. So, it's difficult to imagine that we could get involved in a technical landfill site. We don't have the critical mass, the population, the demographics, to justify it.

490

495

So, to have a technical landfill site that would be managed by the municipal level, we were told that we needed at least fifty thousand (50,000) residents, and we would have to reunite three (3), four (4), if not more, MRC's in the Outaouais to have as many people as that, because, with all the rural MRC's combined, we only come up to seventy thousand (70,000) people. So, we could not seriously consider a private/public partnership, because it was far too expensive for us.

500

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

505 (Translation) And in the case of other MRC's, because we did get a study on ultimate scenarios for waste management of the administrative region of Outaouais, and what we read from this is that there is a need to consult the population and study different alternatives before taking a long-term solution or decision. Did you dialogue, discuss, between you and the City of Gatineau? Could you tell us exactly where you are in that process?

510 MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

515 (Translation) Mme. Chairperson, if you'll allow me, I work for the MRC and have been for three (3) years. I'm an engineer in chemistry, and I have a masters in environment planning. I came back to this region to try and develop a plan for waste management. As someone said this afternoon, burial waste is storing it and not really dealing with the matter, which is why I wanted to find another solution.

520 We had public consultations in 2005, and the alternatives that would allow us to reduce waste or eliminate burial were presented as scenarios. As Mr. Duchesne was saying, we need a critical population mass to implement that type of technology.

525 With regard to the discussions that are absolutely necessary on the regional level to undertake this scope of project, I remember that, in 2004, I was approached by the Regional Council for Sustainable Development to regroup the MRC's in Gatineau to discuss it. And my colleagues that were there before me will tell you that the discussion process had already been ordered, if you will, in the past. And the consultations that gave way to the report you're talking about started last fall.

530 And to answer the question that the gentleman asked, yes, there are other solutions, and it would be ideal to have more options. I'm not trying to denigrate the project that is the topic of discussion today. It's a good project, but, in fact, regional discussions are under way, but are not perhaps yielding fruit early enough. I think yesterday Gatineau announced that it would still be part of those talks.

535 THE COMMISSIONER:

540 (Translation) But the application of the new regulations, don't they come into force at the same time? Why is it so urgent to find a solution in the Pontiac MRC, whereas the other MRC's haven't made a decision and have extended their contracts with the Lachute site? I think we will pursue with the Collines-des-Outaouais MRC representative, but why is it so urgent to decide for the Pontiac MRC?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

545 (Translation) I believe that the Pontiac MRC is not the only one that feels it's urgent. This requirement is imposed on all municipalities, all municipalities that bury their waste. What we know, and we really believe this, is that there will no longer be any extensions to bury our waste or dump them in trenches.

550 And I'll use the following analogy. We're in the ropes, and we dragged our feet too long. And, now, we really have to find a solution to the problem of disposing of our waste matter. The emergency really comes from the regulations themselves.

THE COMMISSIONER:

555 (Translation) But your neighbouring MRC's have the same obligations, and yet they have not determined which method they would prefer.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

560 (Translation) We're on the far west side of the administrative region of Outaouais, and we have to take a very important thing into consideration. And that's the distance between - that separates us and the ultimate treatment centre. So, yes, we can look at other options, but I would admit that the Government of Quebec asked us to envisage Lachute.

565 We went to the site. We met with the site operator. We asked a series of questions. We felt it was very interesting, and, eventually, we could get burial costs that are similar than what we would have in Danford Lake. However, shipment costs would be exorbitant. And there's a municipality in Thornby that has just started shipping its waste to Lachute, and the costs doubled, if not tripled to bury one ton of waste matter.

570 So, if we extrapolate to the entire MRC, we will no longer be able to treat our waste matter. And what will happen is what happens in the far west of Outaouais is that we're going to dump our waste matter near the road, because it will be too expensive to treat our own waste. So, we feel that Danford is an alternative to this situation.

THE COMMISSIONER:

580 (Translation) In your mind, this could also be a regional solution.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Obviously, it could be one regional solution. What we are saying is that it might not be the best of solutions, but, currently, it's the only one available given the requirements

585 that the Government of Quebec has imposed on us.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

590 (Translation) We've been talking about the need to find solutions through consultation in the region for a long time. We first started eleven (11) years ago, when there was a generic consultation on waste matter.

595 When do you think you will be able - and I'm talking to all of the MRC reps, including the Gatineau rep. When will you have an idea of a concrete action plan, where you could find multiple solutions that could be curtailed to your situation, perhaps not be in the ropes, as you said, and use a solution, because it's the only one offered to you? Are you moving along with your consultations in the region?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

600 (Translation) In my humble opinion, as Mme. Lussier was saying, the discussions are moving along, but we're a bit behind, and we're reacting as though we are truly in the ropes, and the ropes can't be cut. We can't go through. This is my analogy. We have to act. We have to find a regional solution to the disposal of waste matter. And, unfortunately, we missed the boat too often, especially for the past four (4) or five (5) years.

610 I remember that, actually, it was at Chateau Montebello in 2003 the regional developers had been invited to the reeves' table to speak to waste management in the region, and I will tell you that we were told to leave, especially by the former Mayor of Gatineau. So, we almost left after fifteen (15), twenty (20) minutes, after they told us or practically showed us the door.

So, in my opinion, if you want to look at a global picture, you have to remember that point. November 10th, 2003, we missed the boat, and there have been consequences since.

615 We don't have a bad project in front of us, but we know that there would be alternatives to technical landfills. However, because of the decisions and choices that were made in the past, we're pretty much in the ropes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

620 (Translation) I think we have a representative of the Comté Des Collines-de-l'Outaouais MRC. Mr. Laliberté, is that right? We haven't heard you yet. Can you tell us a little bit more about your waste management plan? Do you have a plan as the act requires?

625 MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

(Translation) Yes.

630 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Could you table it?

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

635 (Translation) It was already asked of me, and it will be tabled.

THE COMMISSIONER:

640 (Translation) Thank you; now, what percentage of waste is reclaimed in your MRC?

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

645 (Translation) It depends on the municipality. However, I have about fifteen (15) tons that goes to burial, and three thousand five hundred (3,500) tons that goes to recycling through selective measures. And if I calculate quickly, we're talking about fifteen (15), twenty-five percent (25%). My best municipalities are about twenty-five percent (25%) and the not so performant ones at fifteen (15).

THE COMMISSIONER:

650 (Translation) What was your objective?

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

655 (Translation) Fifteen (15) to twenty-five percent (25%) of the total is what we're at, and I don't have our objectives. Are we getting sixty percent (60%) of glass recycling, plastic recycling? I don't have that assessment.

THE COMMISSIONER:

660 (Translation) No, but what's your policy? According to the government's policy, it's to reuse, reclaim.

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

665 (Translation) You're talking about the general objective of sixty percent (60%). Then, yes, it's sixty-five percent (65%).

670 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) And when will you reach that objective?

675 MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

(Translation) To me, we have to insist on compostable material. And, currently, the efforts that we are dedicating to that are more on a voluntary basis and not very well organized. So, until that's not possible, forty percent (40%) of residual waste is not reused or treated otherwise than burying. So, if I don't get those forty percent (40%), I think we'll never reach the sixty-five percent (65%) objective or target.

680 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The Ministry of Sustainable Development, Parks, and Environment. There is an amount of money that is collected when waste is buried, and I think that this is given to Recyc-Québec. The underlying principle was to ensure that the producers of waste, instead of sending all of their waste to burying, that they would give part of the money to help out in recycling, reusing, reclaiming. Can you tell us what's going on with that? What's the amount that is collected per ton buried, and is it sufficient to help municipalities and MRC's with their recycling program? How much money does that represent? Do you have that information?

690 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) We could see theoretically what was forecasted. I don't have the exact amounts that were redistributed to Recyc-Québec. However, on principle, this is what we call a fee we charge per ton. I think it's ten dollars and twenty-two cents (\$10.22). That amount is distributed amongst municipalities, and it's pro rated to their population to help them finance recycling and separate collection, but I would have to look into the act to see exactly what that fee is.

700 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) A supplementary question for Mr. Laliberté, how will you manage waste after December 31st, 2008, when your agreement with the Régie will come to an end?

705 MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

(Translation) First of all, I have two (2) municipalities that do dumping entrenches. So, they will have to be shut down. So, the most possible scenario will probably be until we have an agreement within the region, and until all scenarios have been evaluated. If I'm looking at the next few months after that time line, I don't think we'll have the technology that's necessary to use

710 an alternative. So, we have to make sure that we have disposal services.

I would say that, currently, we are following suit with Gatineau. That's to open a call for proposals, and we'll give ourselves an extra three (3) to five (5) years. And then, the two (2) municipalities that do use dumping entrenches will shut down their sites and use our transshipment centres and join the other five (5) municipalities.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment, and Parks, isn't there a section in the act or the regulations, say, if there were a municipality of less than two thousand (2,000) residents, if that's at less than a hundred (100) kilometres of an existing site, should that site not be forced to take their waste?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson, Michel will answer your question.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

(Translation) It is provided for in the regulations on burial and incineration. All landfills have to accept waste from the surrounding municipalities. The closest landfill must accept the waste from municipalities of less than two thousand (2,000) inhabitants. So, it's not necessarily a hundred (100) kilometres.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, the closest landfill, even if it's over a hundred (100) kilometres.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

(Translation) That's correct.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) In so long as it meets the requirements of the act, it --

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

(Translation) A technical landfill site has to accept the waste of that small municipality, if it is the closest one to that municipality. I'm talking about municipalities of less than two thousand (2,000) inhabitants.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

755 (Translation) Excuse me, Mme. Chairperson, I should clarify that we will not accept that dumping entrenches continues. In the regulation, we will set out provisions that will enable some dumps to stay open. For those municipalities where the landfill will be closed, then the waste will have to be sent to the closest technical landfill site. There will not be a cap on the distance.

760 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) A supplementary question from Ms. Thompson, who is not here and wants us to ask this question, it has to do with the number of trucks that will be going to Lachute every day or that are currently.

765 MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

(Translation) This will depend on the period of the year. We'll say fifteen (15) to eighteen (18) trucks a day, but in periods like the one we are living now, it could be up to twenty-eight (28) trucks a day.

770

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) To get back to residual waste, what's the percentage for reclamation or reuse in Gatineau?

775

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

(Translation) For recyclable matters, we're close to sixty percent (60%) of the objective, of the target, so, sixty percent (60%) of the sixty-five percent (65%) that is targeted by the Government of Quebec. For putrescible material, we're at twelve (12) or thirteen percent (13%) of the objective. So, we have separate collection more often.

780

We were going to collect table waste for Hull and Aylmer, but since the composting site was not opened in time, this separate collection was pushed back. We're looking at different possibilities for that. And the city council should make a decision in that sense before the end of the year.

785

THE COMMISSIONER:

790 (Translation) And what's the timetable to meet the sixty-five percent (65%) target?

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

(Translation) With regard to recyclable matter, next year we will be renewing the

795 recyclable matter collect contract. So, we will have separate collection, but there will also be
collective collection, if you will, and this, we hope, will foster recycling. So, we hope that, by next
year, we'll have a sizable increase. As well, the waste in its plan is looking at the possibility of
prohibiting the disposal of recyclable matter.

800 And with regard to compostable matter, as I said, there has been a delay, but the city will
possibly look at a third collection. That is to say that there would be a collection of disposal, then
recyclable matter, and then compostable matter. So, we're just looking at those possibilities, and
city council should decide shortly.

805 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Can we say that it's very important for the residents to take part in the
municipal town hall meetings to ask their elected body exactly how far it is in that consultation
process amongst themselves, and exactly what mechanisms they have reviewed to maximize
810 recycling and treatment of compostable matter? Is it important to you that the citizens ask their
representatives where exactly the project lies?

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

815 (Translation) I think it's absolutely necessary for the citizen to get involved, because the city
can put together a series of programs, but if the citizens do not own them, then they will fall flat.
That's why the citizens have to express their preferences, voice their concerns, and express their
preference for a system or another, which one will meet their needs in the best fashion.

820 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And the representatives have to understand that the citizens want an
environmentally friendly treatment of waste.

825 MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

(Translation) I would tell you that, in the past year, the representatives of Gatineau have
certainly felt that, because the composting file was all over the papers, in fact, to determine the site
of that composting, the location of that composting site. So, the representatives are very much
830 aware that this is a sensitive topic.

MR. STEVE FOWLER:

835 May I just say something? If I understood correctly, you know, for all the right reasons, all
of the, you know, holistic waste management plans have not been put in place, but, you know, if
you listen to what they're saying here is that, given more time, two (2) things are going to happen.

840 Number 1, they're going to be recycling more. They're going to be composting more.
They're going to be putting less and less required to go to landfill.

845 At the same time, they're going to be looking at other technologies. So, it's very possible,
when they finally figure out what they want to do, it's going to look very different from what we're
looking at today. There's going to be a much less need for this thing. So, what I'm saying is why
are we rushing into this thing, okay. That's really what I'm saying.

850 And so, you answered my question. No, there was no process, and it is a totally
unsolicited proposal. And I warrant should we be spending our tax dollars on an unsolicited
proposal, just because it's the only game in town.

THE COMMISSIONER:

855 (Translation) Who might answer this one? Maybe the spokesperson from the Ministry of
the Environment; I have the preliminary report of the ad hoc committee on the management of
waste in the Outaouais region, and the percentage of reclamation on average is sixteen percent
(16%). These data date back to 2004, 2005, maybe. What's the average in Quebec for
reclamation, and how does the Outaouais region compare to other regions?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

860 (Translation) Mr. Commissioner, we will talk this over amongst ourselves for a sec.
Normally, this kind of data, I mean if there had somebody here from Recyc-Québec, he could have
answered more easily. So, we have to try and see if we have documents, maybe the latest
document out of Recyc-Québec to provide you with this kind of information.

865 THE COMMISSIONER:

870 (Translation) In the meantime, a question addressed to the representative of the Pontiac
MRC; do you have some kind of overall report on waste management or the data? Because this
data doesn't seem to be present in the ad hoc committee's report.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

875 (Translation) I didn't get the first part of your question, sir?

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) In your MRC now, in your RCM, I mean we have data on the reclamation of -
do you have data on the waste reclamation?

880

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) No, we do not have that.

885

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) But there is reclamation?

890

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) This is done, yes, but we don't know exactly how much. That information is not available in the waste management plan, and we mostly talked about the inventory, so to speak, or trying to answer - we looked at answers to questionnaires that we sent out to the different municipalities and to the ICI type companies. Data was very fragmented. As for reclaimed waste, we got no information, and we simply provided the information we had, and which is why we have this kind of information.

895

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Why is it more complicated in your RCM than in others, where there are ten (10), twenty percent (20%) reclamation of waste that is accounted for?

900

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Well, where we are, the situation is quite simple. We have dumping trenches. We tend to throw everything away. It has to be said also that the different municipalities, and probably this is because they have been very lax in their approach, could not provide this kind of information for different reasons that we're not informed of. And, unfortunately, we did not look further into this matter.

905

910

Of course, this was done by a consultants firm, and the choice of the firm was questioned on a number of occasions, because the data was, at times, incomplete in the waste management plan that was submitted to us. So, this may explain why we don't have all of the data.

915

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

920

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Unfortunately, Mr. Commissioner, we do not have data for the different

regions. We have, for 2002 to 2004, overall data for the whole province at large.

THE COMMISSIONER:

925

(Translation) And what are the figures for the province overall?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

930

(Translation) If you'll allow me, Mr. Michel can give you the figures.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

935

(Translation) According to the data for 2004 in a report by Recyc-Québec, for all sectors of activity and for all of the types of waste, the reclamation would be at approximately forty-nine percent (49%).

THE COMMISSIONER:

940

(Translation) Reclamation overall for all of the types of waste.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

945

(Translation) Yes, for - everything is included: municipal waste, industrial waste, construction material, what have you. So, we're at forty-nine percent (49%) overall.

THE COMMISSIONER:

950

(Translation) Mr. Laliberté.

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

955

(Translation) If you will allow me to add a few words to my friend's answer, one thing that has sort of helped us, as we try identifying the basic data and come up with the basic assumptions, most of the RCM's here, in my case, in the case of the city at least, we do have weighing stations, which the dumping entrench type operations do not have. So, I know what my tonnage is. So, if I don't get answers from the different questionnaires, I can extrapolate based on studies such as the Chamard CRIQ Roche study. So, this is something that was of assistance to us.

960

And a few words also on the data that we just provided, forty-nine percent (49%), one might think that if I reclaim twenty-five percent (25%), I do less than what is done on average, but

it has just been said that this includes the ICI's and waste from construction sites and so forth. And if we're talking about recycled asphalt and cement, there's a lot of tonnage, and this would create larger numbers. If we simply dealt with municipal waste, I think our figures would be comparable.

965

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Does anybody have figures in this regard compared with the sixteen percent (16%) of reclamation that is done in the Outaouais?

970

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner, we can provide figures for different municipalities, but the figure that we just saw, twenty-five percent (25%) for the whole province, I think it's twenty-three percent (23%). The other figure we have is for the ICI's, for the ICI's, fifty-eight percent (58%), and construction, demolition, sixty-two percent (62%).

975

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) And for municipal waste, twenty-three percent (23%).

980

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Twenty-three (23) point fifty-eight (23.58) - no, twenty-three (23), fifty-eight (58), and sixty-two (62) depending on the types of waste.

985

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

990

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you; I'd like to ask if Mr. Zenon Chmielowski - I'm sorry if my pronunciation is off. Are you here, sir?

995

MR. ZENON CHMIELOWSKI:

Yes, good evening, Mme. Chair and Mr. Commissioner, my name is Zenon Chmielowski. Don't pronounce the "Ch", please. It makes it much easier.

1000

I have been a resident of Danford Lake since 1982. This is where I chose to live because of the environment. This is not easy because of the expense and hardship of commuting. Yet,

we do make these choices, because we value the environment in which we live. This is a great sacrifice, actually, to live there. It's not that simple.

1005

This is why some of the comments that I've been hearing from the promoter are quite upsetting, because some of our questions are simply brushed off, not given enough consideration. Last Tuesday, I've heard the landfill promoter giving very smooth and prepared answers to all questions.

1010

The questions of the increased traffic were really brushed off and dismissed with some bureaucratic jargon that really didn't mean anything to me. In fact, I've summarized the answer as - in one sentence: LDC expects drivers to drive safely. That was all that they were saying about safety on the highways, no responsibility, no commitment, no accountability for anything that they were going to do to the traffic on highways.

1015

It's very easy to say we're going to have the business, but the Ministry will take care of our highways, or the Ministry is going to use our tax money to fix the problem that a private company is going to create. I see a major problem with this, but that's not really what I wanted to talk about. It was the safety issue that I'm really concerned with.

1020

But before I ask my question, I would like to give you a very good example of the safety issues that we deal with on these highways. In the last years, I've been working as a bus driver, as a school bus driver, where, as everyone understands, safety cannot be undermined. It's something that is on our minds every day every time we take the bus on the road along with the kids. This is all we think: safety, safety, and safety.

1025

Last March, unfortunately, I have come to a near collision with a truck. We're talking about a lot of trucks. I thought my life was ending at that very moment. This was on March 13th, and the report is filed with the police. The case is open. The driver has been identified. If I would be allowed to read just a section of my report to the police, this will probably help to visualize what went on, and that's just not one occurrence.

1030

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1035

(Translation) And you will be having a question at the end of this?

MR. ZENON CHMIELOWSKI:

1040

Yes, yes, this is following. This is leading to a question.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) I would like us to have the map up on the screen, so that we can see these

1045 roads, the map that shows us all the roads. Go ahead, sir.

MR. ZENON CHMIELOWSKI:

Okay, yes, it's just a short section I'm taking out of the entire text.

1050

"The bus trip started in Low St. Michael's School at about fifteen twenty (15:20). Some students were dropped off around Low. About eight (8) high school students stayed at the rear seats of the bus. At about fifteen thirty-five (15:35), I was driving towards Venosta, Quebec, going north. As I was approaching the village and nearing the end of the two (2) lane bypass, I noticed a truck approaching from the rear at the end at a very unusual speed. For a few moments, I had some difficulties assessing the truck driver's intentions. As my bus was positioned on a single lane, it became obvious that the truck driver was not intending to slow down in order to stay behind the bus. At this point, I started to examine my options to safely avoid collision. The road shoulder did not seem very wide, and I was afraid that if the bus had to leave the road, it would certainly be a roll-over with a landing actually six (6) feet below the road level. The situation was very dangerous. I focused all of my attention on the shoulder and decided to use it to get the bus off the paved road. I briefly looked at the truck as it was passing my bus. It seemed to be travelling exactly in the centre of the highway, fifty percent (50%) of its wheel being on both sides of the double yellow line. The truck travelled very fast. By the time I was sure of full control of the bus, the truck was far ahead of me. I was not able to see its colours or identify anything. It was simply too far. I could only say that this was a pull truck without the load."

1055

1060

1065

There was a few other cars involved, and a report was submitted to the police.

1070

Now, the problem with the statement that the truck drivers or any drivers obey the law, obey the roads, and drive safely, well, they don't. That is the fact. They do not. And we don't need many cases per day. We need one, just one. In this case, nine (9) people would have been dead. Nine (9) people could have lost their lives.

1075

Now, the truck driver was identified, but, however, I'm worried that he's going to go free and continue doing this. A story of another bus driver is this. There was a case in Court, and because the bus driver, being the witness, could not identify the face of the offending driver, the driver was let free to continue doing what he did. And I'm sure this driver of this case is going to do the same, because I could not see his face. I could actually hardly see the truck.

1080

So, in addition to this, I just would like to say that, basically, my entire family is spending about four (4) hours on the road per day. My wife commutes to town every day, getting up at five (5:00) and coming back at seven thirty (7:30) or eight (8:00). My daughter goes to school every day from Danford to Hull. She spends again three (3) to four (4) hours, depending on road conditions.

1085

1090 Every day I fear for their lives with the conditions as they are today, with the number of trucks on the road today. I cannot imagine an increase. If anything, that traffic should be decreased or the road improved, which is not going to happen. From what I hear, the Minister says we have a five (5) year plan that will not really change the situation. So, my alternative is either to move out of Danford, leave, or face death every day.

1095 Now, my question is, Mme. Commissioner: What are you going to say to my daughter when I'm dead? I'm a potential victim, sitting in front of you. Mr. Rouleau is going to make more money, but I might be paying with my life. What are you going to see - to say to me, when my daughter is dead or my wife is dead? Who is going to take the responsibility? No one, we're left alone. So, no matter what is said here, at the end of the day, my options are simply leave. Thank you for listening, and I hope Canada can do more to its people. Thank you.

1100 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do you have any further questions? If so, you can register once again.

1105 MR. ZENON CHMIELOWSKI:

No, actually, I didn't want to wash out this question. This is a very important question to everyone on this highway. What is going to be said to these people when their children die? Because they will. It's only a matter of time. It's not an if. It's when. I've been there. I've seen it. It happens.

1110 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1115 (Translation) Thank you; I'll ask you to come back as of the 12th of June for the second phase of the hearings. You could then provide - talk some more about safety or whatever else. It would be up to you to choose your topic that you would like to put to the commission. Mr. Patrick Fowler, please.

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1120 (Translation) Good evening, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, thank you for giving me this opportunity to be here this evening. It has now become clear that environmental discussions are not trying to decide whether or not there will be leaches leaking out or greenhouse gases, or that there will be negative effects of transportation on the Quebec roads.

1125 For instance, the promoter himself has said that environmental damage will be minimal, but that everything is in line with Quebec standards. On the other hand, we've heard people say

that the worst-case scenario would be a catastrophe. So, we can come to the conclusion that the proposed project, this TLS, does pollute. Uncertainty is only with regard to in what amount.

1130 So, my question is: Given the time lines, 2008, and this is coming soon, the public presentation of a single option, and because it is clear that the City of Gatineau, the MRC's of Pontiac, Vallée-de-la-Gatineau have not yet come to define an action plan, does the Government of Quebec - is it willing to postpone this deadline?

1135 So, my question, and I'm trying to clarify what I mean: Can we postpone the 2008 deadline? Is there a plan B? Have all the municipalities and regions - will they all be sending their waste to Lachute? Would there penalties imposed by the Government of Quebec, if things are not in compliance?

1140 And as an add-on to my question, in the plan, ultimate waste 2008, 1998/2008, the government says that we must provide support for this kind of action. There's a lot of change. Development is important for our environment. And I would like to know what the Government of Quebec has done to try and financially support activities in this area. And given the present situation and what we're hearing here at the BAPE, what could they do to make sure that, in the
1145 end, everybody will be healthier, and that this would be good for the environment?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you; the Ministry of Sustainable Development, the Environment, and
1150 Parks.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Yes, Mme. Chair, of course, right now, there is no plan. There is no leeway.
1155 We can't say that we would postpone the January, 2009 deadline. This I can tell you. This is not a possibility.

As for penalties, well, I think we're not really looking into this immediately. It's not the government that would tell the municipalities that is not a compliance, that it will have to pay fines.
1160 There will be warnings and possibly negotiations with the government, with the Ministry, but I can't tell you exactly that there would be fines imposed on the municipalities and, therefore, to the citizens.

MR. PATRICK FOWLER:

1165 (Translation) Well, in this case, in that case, we may come to the conclusion - we can say that we can take our time. We're not in a position where we're forced to go down that road. Municipalities and regions might decide to do what is appropriate, to define the best options, and

1170 look into all of the possibilities. So, let's not commit to something that we will have to live with for
hundreds of years.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1175 (Translation) What I can say, Mme. Chair, is that we cannot take it for granted that
municipalities are acting in bad faith. We take it for granted that everybody will try and be in
compliance with the deadline. And as we've seen, the government, through royalties and different
measures, that they are trying to encourage recycling and so forth, so, to try and make things
easier for the municipalities. So, I think both the provincial government and the different
municipalities and the MRC's, everybody has to work hand in hand to meet this deadline.

1180

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1185 (Translation) Would - the cost of using landfill sites, is it approximately similar to, say,
reclamation of recyclable waste, so that we could try and avoid saying - sending these wastes into
landfill sites?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1190 (Translation) By and large, Mme. Chair, the cost of recycling is higher than the cost of
using landfill sites. As for technologies, well, of course, incineration costs are even higher than
burying waste on a TLS.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1195 (Translation) Well, to try and reverse the situation and to force a greater use of recycling,
because the goal for 2008, I mean, this deadline, we won't necessarily - it won't be easy to meet
that deadline based on what we're hearing. So, have you looked at the possibility of increasing
royalties for burying waste in landfill sites and helping municipalities to recycle and do reclamation
and so forth?

1200

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1205 (Translation) Well, the government does expect that these will be on the way up, these
royalties, but not to the point where, by 2009, everything will be in compliance and...

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

1210 (Translation) Well, in fact, I'm getting mixed up here, but there's 102 and 130, two (2)
different acts. So, the royalties, two dollars (\$2.00) a ton, which is paid back to the municipalities,
and the basic principle is that the ICI's, etc., they also pay this money, ten dollars (\$10.00). So,

there's more money that is being sent to the municipality. This is part of the support that is being provided.

1215 The other thing, the other measure, I mean the contribution on the part of companies, you know, that do packaging and printed media to separate collection, I mean I don't really have the dates of when this will be effective, but as of this year or last year, if I'm not mistaken, fifty percent (50%) of the cost of separate collection is being paid for by a municipality - that is being paid by municipalities brings in money that is financed by those other producers.

1220 So, I'm just saying this to provide information. So, there is a certain degree of compensation in this regard.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1225 (Translation) So, things are changing, although not as fast as people would like them to change, thank you; Mr. Michel Turcot.

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

1230 (Translation) Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, good evening, my question is addressed or has to do with the choice of location for this landfill site. In the initial project or the notice of project on the part of LCD on page 10, it is said that the soil in the Pontiac is granite. This is the Canadian shield. It is also written that it - the bedrock is almost impermeable.

1235 Later on the same page, page 10, it is written that some two-thirds of the surface waters at the landfill site, two-thirds of this surface water, flows into the Picanoc River and the other third towards Lake Johnson. These waterways are part of the Gatineau River watershed.

1240 Now, also, in the impact assessment study on page 32, all I have is page 32, 33 here, but it's written that these criteria result in the zones that are favourable are in the height of lands in the Laurentians that are part of the Canadian shield, as shown on the map in appendix C.

1245 You can see that this is the southeast part of the Pontiac RCM that is in line with these selection criteria, especially for the following reasons. So, we have here one (1), two (2), three (3), four (4), five (5), five (5) reasons, and the sixth one is the presence of Gatineau Park and many lakes and rivers that are important. Large surfaces for the watersheds in the Vallée de la Gatineau RCM and Collines-de-l'Outaouais, as well, are criteria that might bring us to exclude having TLS's on this territory. Now, is this true? This is part of the impact assessment study.

1250 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The Ministry of Sustainable Development, Parks, and Environment, are

these criteria that would be grounds for rejecting a site?

1255 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) The proponent decides what the criteria would be. What we ask of them is that the site found meets the parameters found in the Quebec government's regulations.

1260 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do you ask that other options be studied and that the demonstration be made with regard to the choice?

1265 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Yes, absolutely, we require that.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1270

(Translation) But that choice is made based on the criteria the proponent defines.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1275

(Translation) Yes, insofar as the proponent has to choose a site that meets the standards on waste burial and also that is acceptable from an environment standpoint, but you can't lose sight of the fact that, in the regulations, there are operating parameters, creation parameters, and standards for follow-up as well.

1280

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Would this mean that another proponent could have chosen and to make a proposal in that watershed, and still meet the regulations' requirements?

1285

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) It's quite possible, Mme. Chairperson, because there's municipal zoning, and the municipal zoning doesn't mean that it respects all technical parameters?

1290

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

(Translation) So, why does the proponent himself - in the impact study, why would he say, and this is quite clear, that the presence of large watersheds in Outaouais are criteria that would exclude this site? This impact study says it. And in the project's presentation on page 10,

1295 it said clearly that the hydrography of the site is such that two-thirds of surface water flows through the Picanoc River and the rest towards the Donaldson Lake.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1300 (Translation) If you'll allow me, Mme. Chairperson, I just said that the exclusion parameters are chosen by the proponent to exclude the sites that he doesn't want to retain.

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

1305 (Translation) But he's talking about his own site here.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1310 (Translation) Those are the parameters that the proponent has defined, but as the Ministry's representative has said, another proponent could have said we feel that the conditions in the MRC in the Vallée-de-la-Gatineau would be acceptable to build the site. What I understand from it is that there is no policy. It's a choice. It's a choice that the government doesn't have to agree with, but this is the proposal that the proponent has made, and this is how he defines it.

1315 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

(Translation) So, there is no regulation that says that the fact that it will flow or run off into the watersheds that can end up in any river or any lake in Vallée-de-la-Gatineau or the Gatineau hills, that would not prevent the building of the site? It wouldn't be sufficient?

1320

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) No, Mme. Chairperson, because the standards that the Ministry has established aim at protecting sensitive environments, if you will. It doesn't say at fifty (50) metres from a river or at one hundred (100) metres. No, I shouldn't even be talking about metres, but let's say fifty (50) kilometres of a lake, you cannot have a technical land site or, in a watershed of a large river, there cannot be a TLS. We know it can happen. That's why the regulation has protection standards, environment protection standards.

1330 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Does this answer your question?

MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

1335

(Translation) It's not that clear, but thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1340 (Translation) But there is no standard to determine what considerations have to be taken into account for one territory or another. Other proponents could have and may still propose and define conditions in the Gatineau Valley MRC, define them as acceptable to find a site. This is what we understand from the Ministry's response.

1345 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson, to answer more simply, any proponent could have said I will decide on a TLS in a radius of fifty (50) kilometres. Above fifty (50) kilometres, I will not build a TLS. And another proponent could have said I will find a TLS within a hundred (100) kilometre radius. These are parameters that they define according to their economic assessment or according to the type of matter they want to treat, but this is his choice. It is not regulated. What is regulated is the protection of the environment. What we say is once you choose that site, it has to meet this and that criteria.

1355 MR. MICHEL TURCOT:

(Translation) Very well, so, if I understand correctly, all the criteria - no, I'm sorry, not criteria, but all the conditions that are defined as fulfilled for that site are complete free choice. They will be regulated afterwards, but it's a free choice for the proponent. They're completely random.

1360 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Correct.

1365 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Gerry Toomey, is Mr. Toomey here? No? Mr. George McCormick, and following this intervention, we will be breaking.

1370 MR. GEORGE McCORMICK:

Mme. Chairperson, Mr. Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, my name is George McCormick. We have a four (4) season residence within about seven (7) kilometres of the proposed landfill site. I certainly have concerns about the Danford landfill from a health and safety point of view.

We heard at the Mont Ste. Marie session a couple of nights about seagulls, and I think

1380 that the promoter's technical experts talked about there's some seagull populations up at the Baskatong, but we, of course, know that there are lots of seagulls around the dumps in the area.

1385 So, I have concerns about the sand covering of the landfill after each day and concerns about the seagulls in and around Danford, you know, causing diseases to the adjacent lakes. I have concerns about the amount of soil needed to cover that landfill after each day to ensure that the birds won't be attracted to that site.

1390 So, my question to the promoter is: How will the promoter ensure that enough soil is used to cover the garbage, so the birds will not be attracted, and how deep, how deep a layer of that covering will actually be used to cover that landfill at the end of each day to ensure that the birds are not attracted to that, to that site?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1395 (Translation) I would address one general question to the Health & Social Services Ministry with regard to seagulls. Did you study those issues and how large the problem it is?

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

1400 (Translation) Yes, in fact, the day before last, I filed in Lac Ste. Marie a document that I spoke to two (2) days ago that, to me, is one of the best on the matter. It's called "Controlling Seagulls", and it's from a Lachenaie treatment plant. And I also filed another document that dates back to 1992 that's found on the Internet. It's "Gulls, Public Safety Risk". And I also filed the last brief of the Lanaudière health branch on a TLS in St. Thomas-de-la-Lanaudière.

1405 All three (3) documents say pretty much the same thing. There is no forecastable repercussion on the health, but we know that gulls are a nuisance. Therefore, we must do everything in our power to reduce the number of gulls that could be attracted, for example, on a small island in the River of Picanoc.

1410 And the method that is most efficient, the reduction of the attraction for the birds is done through backfilling or covering, but it should be done more than once a day, because once a day is truly just a way to not let the population explode.

1415 In Lachenaie, it's covered more than once a day. In their case, there is also a hawkler. And if necessary, he releases hawks. I don't know if it's necessary in this case, but what you have to understand is the smaller the facade of waste, the less it will be attractive to the gulls. That's why it has to be covered as often as possible.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1420 (Translation) Mr. Rouleau.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1425 (Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson, Tuesday night, it was confirmed through the
commission that all abatement measures and the best available technologies on top of generously
covering and as often as possible, we're talking about fifteen (15) to twenty (20) centimetres at the
least for soil that's already available on location, and it's already a very sandy area. We will use
that. And the fact that there are already birds of prey in the area should help us as well.

1430

So, it's quite obvious to us that we must limit the amount of birds, and we have, in fact,
been told that we can add paint. This is what Sherbrooke does. Sherbrooke wasn't given the
permit to cull, although other municipalities have received a licence to cull the birds. Those that
could not painted the eggs of the nesting areas, and this managed to reduce the number of birds
by curtailing reproduction.

1435

THE COMMISSIONER:

1440 (Translation) The suggested solution by the Ministry or the representative of the Ministry of
Health is possible for you? Do you think you could cover more than once a day?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1445 (Translation) I myself was the Director of Operations in Central America for two (2) years,
and this is exactly the method we used. We did covering in the morning and in the afternoon. So,
it's obvious that when we're told that we will - or when we say that we will cover with a thick layer,
that means that we're going to try and have a very small facade of waste and cover as soon as
possible, so that the gulls are kept away, but, really, you have to deal with the source. The best
thing is to not have any birds, not prevent them from coming, but just not have any.

1450

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1455 (Translation) If you'll allow me a supplementary answer, to reduce the frontage of burial
and to cover it more than once a day, that's a common practice for efficient management, because
a smaller surface reduces the number of soil required to cover the waste. And frequent cover
helps in compacting, which is also crucial to proper management.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1460 (Translation) Ministry of Environment, Parks, Sustainable Development, when we looked at
enlarging the TLS in Ste. Sophie, citizens came forth with pictures demonstrating that there were
massive problems with the seagulls, and that the seagulls then also went in lakes in the

1465 area. At that time, we were told that there would be an investigation to find solutions. Could you check with the people from your regional branch to see where that process is, and if there are still currently problems in Ste. Sophie, and exactly what methods were used to reduce the number of birds?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1470 (Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson, we will check as soon as possible.

MR. GEORGE McCORMICK:

1475 Mme. Chair, just another question, well, so, as far as covering with fifteen (15) to twenty (20) centimetres of soil perhaps twice a day, do we perhaps have enough soil on that site to cover for the next twenty-five (25), thirty (30) years, or do we have perhaps truck in some new soil to help cover the site? What would - what's the talk or what's the answer there?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1480 (Translation) Mr. Rouleau.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1485 (Translation) I'll let Mr. Yves Gagnon answer the question.

MR. YVES GAGNON:

1490 (Translation) Yes, Mme. Chairperson, in the main report - I could mention the page - there is a table that gives you the excavation volumes and the ones that are projected, the ones we will use. I'll try and find the page here.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1495 (Translation) TR3.1 is the document.

MR. YVES GAGNON:

1500 (Translation) It's found in table 5.1 of page 209. What we say, really, is that, within that table, there is a breakdown of the different volumes extracted. We're talking about an excavation of about one million two hundred thousand (1,200,000) square metres of soil, which is mainly sand with a little bit of small particles and aggregate materials. And we would use seven hundred fifty thousand (750,000) square metres for daily covering.

1505 So, I think I said two (2) days ago that since we want to cover with fifteen (15) to twenty
(20) centimetres, we should be aiming or we should requiring about one million square metres. So,
the two hundred fifty thousand (250,000) square metres that would be missing could come from
the site itself, because there are still some areas that are, if you will, that are intact and where we
could find some sand.

1510

MR. GEORGE McCORMICK:

 Just - anyway, in my opinion, the project is not acceptable as it presently stands. We
should look at alternatives to this project such as new technology, and that's all I have, okay, thank
1515 you.

1515

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

 (Translation) And thanks to you, do you have any other questions? Do you want to re-
1520 register?

1520

MR. GEORGE McCORMICK:

 Perhaps, I'll check, okay, thank you, merci.

1525

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

 (Translation) Very well, yes, a supplementary?

1530

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

 (Translation) Just a supplementary piece of information with regard to new technologies,
during the week and especially tonight, we've heard about other options frequently. And before the
break, I would like to introduce the very important fact that the method, not the technology, but the
1535 method behind technical landfill sites is recognized by the Ministry of the Environment and the
major firms as the most economical method on the market today. That fact is very important. The
capacity to pay on the part of the citizens has to be taken into account when one assesses new
technologies.

1540

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

 (Translation) Thank you; we will breaking for ten (10) minutes, and the register remains
open.

1545

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

THE COMMISSIONER:

1550 (Translation) I have a question addressed to the spokesperson for the Ministry of Health & Social Services, Mr. Poissant. You've been listening to the proceedings since the very beginning of these public hearings. No doubt you've read the impact study especially as concerns health. You've heard the different concerns expressed by people here and experts in health. And because you're aware of the possible impact on health of this kind of project, what do you believe to be the main concerns when you hear citizens about these issues, and when you look at the impact study?

1555

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

(Translation) I've many things to say.

1560

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) We're listening to you.

1565

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

(Translation) I do understand that citizens may feel worried in terms of toxicology. For the non-initiated, for the non-expert, when you see cancer causing, that sort of word, well, cancer causing, therefore, dangerous. So, people don't necessarily see the nuance.

1570

I've studied this issue from the very outset. I've analyzed it some two (2) years ago, actually, in the spring of 2006. So, I'm well informed of the way things are done in other landfill sites in Quebec.

1575

So, the first thing that struck me looking at this report is that, in terms of health, it's an ideal site. I'm talking about the specific site, the location, as compared what was done elsewhere in Quebec. I'd like to explain this.

1580

In other places in Quebec, say, in Lachenaie, very often the dwellings are pretty close, and they have their own wells. So, one thinks, well, maybe fifty (50) years from now, this - the wells wouldn't be impacted. So, maybe fifty (50) years down the line, underground contamination might occur. That's one concern.

1585

Another concern if the dwellings are close to the site, one might think, well, how about the biogas? Will it all burn? Will there still be methane particles in the air, in the atmosphere? In other words, it's the difference between contamination and the population being exposed to these.

I, of course, deal in people's health. I don't deal in frogs. I deal in human health. So, when I saw the document, I thought this is an ideal location to be treating this waste.

1590 However, my concern, which is still a concern, the major one in my book here, and this was raised on a number of occasions, is the issue of transportation of these substances. That is dangerous. There's a lot more risk of having car accidents, for instance. One gentleman, the bus driver, spoke to this issue. So, the increase in risk is way greater when we look at road transportation as opposed to toxicology.

1595 Now, I do understand that one has to be an expert to understand that, in this specific instance, it is negligible. And this is my other point, negligible if things are done the way they're supposed to be done. To make sure that things are done as planned, I believe that a watchdog committee or a vigilance committee has to be there and effective. And this may be the challenge,
1600 a committee that is capable, if, of course, the project went ahead, capable of having support and trust on the part of local population and being effective, efficient, over time, being able to go through the long haul.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1605 (Translation) You know what the regulation states, the regulation that defines how this kind of committee is to be set up. Would you have any recommendations to the commission in this regard to make sure that these people are representative, trustworthy?

1610 MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

 (Translation) Well, no, not this evening, but I expect to come back when we hear the briefs. And in the meantime, I'll try and think this through. I've read good documents. I read a good document some four (4) years ago. I'll lay my hands on it and see how this kind of committee can
1615 be created, so that it be effective, and this will be the topic of a brief on my part.

THE COMMISSIONER:

 (Translation) Well, we appreciate your wanting to file a brief, but as for transportation, you
1620 say that this is your main source of concern. There is more risk in that regard for citizens. Do you see any solutions?

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

1625 (Translation) Well, if the producers of the waste - well, the main producer would be the City of Gatineau. There are others elsewhere. If it were closer to Gatineau or, say, before Wakefield, this would be great. We're talking about Route 105 between Wakefield and Kazabazua. That's where the problem lies. The road there is tortuous. There are many curves,

and there are many large trucks already.

1630

If you increase by a hundred and twenty-two (122) per day, I think this is my source of concern. And I don't have a magical solution. The Ministry of Transportation says - had their say as to what they were going to do in the next few years, but that's it.

1635 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you, Mr. Poissant.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1640

(Translation) I'd like to mention that, in the room here, we also have Mr. Bernard Chartrand, who is the spokesperson for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Regions. If you have any reasons - any questions, I mean, to ask of that Ministry, he could field those. Moving on now, Mr. Shannon Martin, please.

1645

MR. SHANNON MARTIN:

Thank you; my name is Shannon Martin. I'm a member of the coalition, and we've heard some mention of a watchdog committee. And we've been told at different meetings in Danford Lake that there was such a committee, and we know that there was. And I'd like Mr. Rouleau to tell us what the watchdog committee has been doing.

1650

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; first of all, this is a committee that would on the part of the - the municipality has a committee that was supposed to act as an embryo, so to speak, on the way toward the creation of a watchdog committee. And some of the members of that committee, of this committee, might participate in the activities of a watchdog committee that still has to be created.

1660

During the meetings that were held, and I mentioned this already, the meetings mostly dealt with Q & A's, questions, answers. People asked questions. We were answering, and we might spend an hour and a half, two (2), two and a half (2½) hours just doing that. So, most of the activities concentrated on that matter.

1665

When certain events occurred, the executive of that committee decided that all of the committee's activity would cease for a while, until a final decision were taken as to whether or not the project were to go ahead.

1670 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Well, what else might they have done in addition to answer questions, so that citizens have answers to their questions? I mean we're in the stage where we're upstream before the project kicks in. Is there anything else that you expected from such a committee?

1675

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) I personally, no, I didn't expect anything else. I can't see what else that group of people could have done. It was just a matter of answering people's questions. That's why it was created, as they looked at this issue of a possible TLS. And maybe they could have identified certain things that could have been done in an improved manner. This is still Q & A, though. It's a matter of making sure that as much information as possible was relayed, and that people could understand the project.

1680

1685 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Did they have any written suggestions during public meetings to try and find solutions, to answer the different concerns?

1690

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) No, it was pretty informal. Around a table, people came together at the fire department, for instance, in a meeting room. Everybody was there seated, and questions came up, and it was quite informal, as I said.

1695

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, there weren't really any solutions, any different approaches or add-ons or --

1700

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Well, there was a lot of talk, and we took into account a number of possibilities during the notice, as we were writing the notice for this project and along the way. So, we did follow some of the pieces of advice and some of the ideas that came up on the part of people.

1705

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1710

(Translation) And this was not necessarily formal or in written form.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) No.

1715

MR. SHANNON MARTIN:

I think it was rather informal. I think, around town, it was sort of called Denis Rouleau's beer and pizza club. So, anyway, I'd like now to take off that hat and put on my hat as the President of a cottage association, Mme. Commissioner.

1720

I'm the President of the Danford Lake and District Property Owners Association. And we have about two hundred and fifty (250) cottagers in our area, and they're on eight (8) different lakes, and I'm just going to give you the names of those lakes in case that comes up.

1725

There's Danford Lake, which is a lake and not to be confused with the village. There's Little Danford, McConnell, Lyon, McAuley, Shay, Egg Lake, and Farm Lake. And these lakes are located about two (2) kilometres or even less west of the village of Danford Lake, and in an area that's probably about the same distance from the garbage dump that Danford Lake village is because of the geography. They are located on Highway 301.

1730

Now, in regards to the imposition of the proposed mega dump on the community, many members have approached me in their concern for the protection of this area, and they fear that the mega dump will bring a number of things. They will bring pollution of their lakes by seagulls and rats, eventual pollution of the ground water and especially the Picanoc River, unreasonable traffic noise, and the dangers of increased traffic on country roads that aren't built for this kind of traffic, and the accidents that will result from the increased traffic, and a drop in property values amongst many other concerns.

1735

But the overriding sentiment that is expressed to me is abject dismay that anyone would entertain the idea of destroying a beautiful natural setting enjoyed by everyone in the area with this kind of project, with this kind of project, and disbelief that there has been very little effort on the part of the promoter and the municipal council to look into other technology, which might be safer and have far less impact on the environment.

1740

Many of these people have read in the newspapers that we are living in what is called the post-landfill era. The question that they ask me and the question that I ask you all here, and especially Mr. Rouleau, is: How in God's name would anyone choose a site in the middle of lakes and rivers for building a giant hole in the ground, on top of which there would be a thirty (30) storey mountain of garbage over thirty (30) years?

1745

1750

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, I'll give the floor to Mr. Poulin. You go ahead. It's okay. Go

1755 ahead.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1760 (Translation) Well, in actual fact, it all has to do with the need for us to go ahead with this project. So, this is the most important chapter and the reason for this project to exist. This is what needs to be understood. The reason why I take the floor is that, right at the outset, Tuesday evening, we described the overall present situation in the Outaouais. So, I would like to once again read the seven (7) justifications or motives for this project.

1765 The main ones are that, since 1991 now, there has been no landfill site or no technology, just talking about land - not just landfill, but there is no infrastructure to dispose of the waste in the Outaouais. So, in 1991, not since then, that's sixteen (16) years. There's only one landfill site, sanitary landfill site, that exists, and it will shut down a year from now. There's the dilution site. And almost all of the fifty (50) or so dumping entrenches in the Outaouais have to shut down by
1770 2009.

And we have to understand that this is why, and this is very technical, but the dumping entrenches and burning garbage constitute an environmental risk and a risk to public health. Burning waste, burning garbage is dangerous. There's still dumping entrenches, even though as
1775 of last year it's prohibited, where they burn garbage, because they have no other choice. The Ministry of the Environment tolerates these. They don't have any choice, because there's no more room.

So, even though it has been prohibited as of last year, there is still dumping entrenches or
1780 that kind of operation, where they burn garbage. And this is a risk in terms of cancer-causing substances. So, this is a risk in the Outaouais area.

And the Quebec policy in terms of managing waste says that we must actually do things in
1785 a way that is regionally based, based on the RCM's. We're talking here about a policy.

Certain environmental organizations say that, and this is true, that, well, why should it be
this small municipality that would have to live with the impacts, the possible repercussions of this
project? Well, be it Danford Lake or La Pêche or Mont Ste. Marie, there will always be a township
that will have to live with the consequences.

1790 So, the justification for the project is that, sooner or later, we need to act. And this is the point. As Mr. - well, the representative from the Pontiac RCM has said, we have our backs to the wall.

1795 MR. SHANNON MARTIN:

Well, I've heard that many times before, the argument of, well, it has got to go

somewhere, right, but the answer is: Does it just have to go anywhere that they choose?

1800 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Can somebody answer that question?

1805 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, if I may, when it's a matter of choosing and you decide that this is where it's going to be done, of course, for certain people, certain people will say that's just anywhere, but you have to come to a conclusion and choose a location. The proponent has studied different possibilities, and this site, I mean it's a matter of meeting the Ministry's standards. And if it's acceptable, well, you don't really have a choice.

MR. SHANNON MARTIN:

1815 That should really have been answered by the promoter, but I accept that answer, but I really don't find it very comfortable to find that the government representatives are really making the case for the promoter. I find I'm uncomfortable about that.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1820 (Translation) One moment, please, what has been said, what was said, I'm not sure how it came through in the translation, but is that we don't have any other option. There is but one that's on the table. It's not a matter of - I mean what is here before us is one location. It's not a matter of what do you think out of these three (3) or four (4) possible options.

1825 The analysis on the part of the proponent has led to choosing one option, one possibility. What the spokesperson from the Ministry has said is that we don't have here, in the impact study, three (3) different options. What is being presented to us is one possibility. If we had three (3), perhaps we could say, well, that one seems to be more interesting, and this one appears to be better, but this is the proposal. There is but one. There is only one site.

1830 Go ahead, sir. I saw your reaction, and I did understand that probably we're not getting the right understanding.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1835 (Translation) I'd like to say once again, and this was part of the instructions that the Ministry sent out, it was a matter of studying different options, but of opting for a site. I did not say two (2), three (3), or four (4). One site had to be picked.

1840 Now, because they opted for a site, it doesn't mean that the government is in agreement with that choice or the project. The analysis will be carried out. If the project is acceptable in terms of the environment, well, then the government can authorize it, but specify conditions or authorize it as such, which would be surprising, or even turn it down. Everything is still on the table.

1845 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Madam, if you want to go to the table there, please, alongside the gentleman, if you want to provide additional information. Go ahead.

1850 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) When I hear that the proponent chose that site, because, according to his study, it's the only one available, I would like to point out that previous studies were carried out, and only in Outaouais, in 1988, over thirty (30) sites were identified. In the Pontiac MRC, there were
1855 four (4) that were identified.

And the only reason why the proponent chose Alleyn-and-Cawood, Mme. Chairperson, is because the municipal council in Alleyn-and-Cawood accepted the site. It is not because it is the best site from an environmental standpoint. And I think it's very important to underscore this.

1860 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Very well, thank you.

1865 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) We're told that the representative of the Des Collines-de-l'Outaouais MRC has something to add. Go ahead, Mr. Laliberté.

1870 MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

(Translation) I had a comment to make following the comment that was made by Mr. Poulin before the break with regard to the fact that burial was the most economical solution and perhaps the only one we could afford, something to that effect. The one that was in line with our
1875 capacity to pay, he said. I would like to remind everyone that when that type of technology is assessed for sustainable environmental practices, we cannot only base our decision on economical reasons.

However, I would add that, by using a dump or a landfill, as manager of residual matter, I
1880 have to provide for composting. I'm not trying to say that others aren't possible, but I think that a

third avenue is possible, and that's composting. Composting can be done through a special plant. If I look at the discussions I've had with Recyc-Québec, we're talking about seventy-five (75) to a hundred dollars (\$100.00) more.

1885 So, if Mr. Poulin is just talking about the treatment, then he might be right, but if we add sorting that third avenue, which is composting, then if I make my calculations, I'm not quite sure that there are the economies of scale that he claims.

1890 Now, I don't have a precise answer, because as we said earlier, the studies depend on discussions that have not taken place or are not finished as we speak. So, I think it's very important to take this into consideration.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1895 (Translation) Do you intend to present a brief for the second part of the hearings?

MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

1900 (Translation) That's possible.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

1905 MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

1910 (Translation) A supplementary point of information, in the current context, municipalities could enact all kinds of measures to recycle. Ultimately, not everything can be reused or recycled. So, whether you choose sorting and sorting with compost that has a much higher rate of return, there's still thirty (30) or forty percent (40%) of matter that will have to be disposed of, whether it's through incineration or burial. Despite all of those technologies to reuse, recycle, reclaim, we still have to dispose of some of the matter.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1915 (Translation) And what is the most economical fashion at the time, at the current time?

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

1920 (Translation) Burial, unfortunately, is still the least expensive solution.

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

1925 (Translation) Mme. Chairperson, what the representative of the City of Gatineau said is true. However, if you remove organic matter through sorting from those, from the waste matter, it would allow us to eliminate a nuisance such as seagulls. If there is no organic matter in the waste, the seagulls will not be attracted to it.

1930 Also, this afternoon, someone said something with regard to leachate water. It's true that covering prevents water from infiltrating, but organic compostable matter such as table waste, when they decompose, they produce a liquid. Everybody has forgotten their trash can at some point and seen the liquid at the bottom. Organic matter does produce liquid. So, perhaps landfilling is necessary, if we choose sorting. However, I feel that a nuisance such as seagulls would be considerably reduced.

1935

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) I thought that the leachate water diminished with time. And when we talked about water infiltration, we were talking about the last phase of the life cycle of the site.

1940

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

1945 (Translation) As far as I know, degradation of organic matter is not done instantaneously. Anybody who does domestic composting knows that a banana peel or a melon don't take the same amount of time to decompose. The same thing for other materials such as wood, wood sometimes cannot be reclaimed. It's also part of the biomass. So, that is organic matter in a chemical standpoint, and these do decompose and become a nuisance.

1950 To my knowledge, the production of leachate in time, if I take out the precipitation from the equation, is difficult to forecast, and it's also very irregular. I would quote as an example the landfill sites that already use biogas. If I look at the Miron quarry, the concentration varies a lot. It is very weak at some points in time and very high at other. The degradation is very difficult to forecast, and I know that some sites are still running now, and it's certainly not solely because of precipitation.

1955

THE COMMISSIONER:

1960 (Translation) But the post-shutdown program that lasts thirty (30) years after the operations are ended, do they not take degradation into account, the degradation that will continue on for an extra thirty (30) years? Is that it?

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

(Translation) If I understand what Mr. Mbaraga said from the Environment Ministry, the

1965 thirty (30) year watch was put in place to make sure that there is a follow-up after shutdown. However, according to what he mentioned to us, after that period of thirty (30) years, a verification will be conducted to see if the site has finished its production of leachate.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1970

(Translation) Mr. Laliberté, the City of Gatineau has the Cooke site, and it has had it in place for sixteen (16) or seventeen (17) years. Perhaps they have figures for us that could demonstrate if there is reduction of the leachate production through time.

1975 MR. PATRICK LALIBERTE:

(Translation) As far as the Cooke site goes, the Cooke site was closed in 1991. And what we observe today with regard to leachate is the concentration of metals or other components in the leachate has diminished quite a bit in time. And, currently, the pumped leachate, it's still treated on the site, and it nearly meets the criteria for environmental discharge, except for a few parameters. So, the quality of the leachate has improved a lot through time.

1980 For biogas, yes, the production of biogas has started to reduce for the past few years. So, there is that typical curb. There's an increase of biogas production. It reaches its apex, and then it starts reducing. So, as far as the City of Gatineau is concerned, yes, after fifteen (15) or sixteen (16) years, there is a reduction, but, after thirty (30) years, will it be entirely gone? I cannot say.

1985 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The studies have demonstrated that it can take much longer than thirty (30) years after shutdown. I don't even know if it has been measured over a hundred (100) years, though.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1995

(Translation) Exactly, and with the membrane technology, they haven't been in place for a hundred (100) years or even thirty (30). However, to meet the requirements, when municipalities make compost and if they want to meet the objectives of recycling, they will have to use compost. If we eliminate compostable material from what is buried, the composition of leachate water and biogas will change significantly. There will be far less production of these.

2000 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) We're going to talk about the location of the site. In other areas in Quebec, there are technical landfill sites in agricultural areas, Ministry of Sustainable Development,

2005

Environment, and Parks, closer to the production sources.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2010 (Translation) Yes, some sites have been de-zoned. So, they've obtained a certification from the commission for the protection of agricultural land. And so, they were zoned agricultural before.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2015 (Translation) So, is that not a strict criteria to say that they cannot be put in place in agricultural areas?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2020 (Translation) If we can avoid it, it's better from an agricultural standpoint as well as from an environmental standpoint, because, normally, these zones are very close to residential areas.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2025 (Translation) Right, but is it preferable then, from a human or environmental standpoint, to choose wooded areas? Is that a criteria?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2030 (Translation) Yes, the farther the TLS is from residential areas, the better it is, obviously. There are a lot of concerns that are dealt with at the source. For example, if there were odour problems, if it's far from any dwellings, then the problem is dealt with.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2035 (Translation) But the location of the source of production of these residual matter, should we not try to get closer to the source rather than go farther, if we find areas that meet the environmental parameters? I'm thinking about green gas emissions, greenhouse gas emissions in shipment, etc.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2045 (Translation) There are a series of parameters to weigh out to find a site that is ideal. The site that we are analyzing here, people say it's far from the population. There's a lot of wood in the area. The technology is acceptable. Therefore, it should be acceptable, but if you look at

the local population, people don't want it. So, to answer your question, ideally, we should try and get it as close to the source population as possible, but the closer it gets to the population, the more people are against it.

2050

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Yes?

2055

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

(Translation) As an add-on to the TLS and its location, yes, it would be better to have it closer to the production source. However, if we look at the City of Gatineau's experience, and at that time it was Communauté régionale de l'Outaouais, so, in the 1980's, this city had tried to find a new landfill site since Cooke would be closed. And over thirty (30) sites had been identified. Some of them are found in the waste management plan.

2060

The sites that were identified on the current City of Gatineau, almost all those sites were found in agricultural areas. And every time the sites were met with a refusal on the part of the Commission for the Protection of Agricultural Land. They would not allow a landfill site to be designed there.

2065

That was the problem the regional community of Gatineau was found - found itself at the time. We did not want to sacrifice the agricultural land for the landfill site. The commission that aims at protecting agricultural land felt that it was too much of a trade off. So, each and every site that was proposed was rejected.

2070

And following that, in the mid-1990's, the City of Gatineau undertook studies to build an incinerator, and the project was stopped during the call for tender phase. And a few months later, the Government of Quebec imposed a moratory on incineration, which was lifted recently.

2075

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Incinerators and landfills.

2080

MR. JACQUES NADEAU:

(Translation) Correct.

2085

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Another clarification with regard to the location criteria for these sites and

2090 the use of these landfill sites, in the papers, some information was published, and it should be brought to the commission's attention. The City of Gatineau apparently, amongst its location criteria for landfill sites, includes the public nature of the land. The Lachute site is now private. That is why there are talks to send the waste to Trois-Rivières soon.

2095 You talked about greenhouse gases earlier and about sustainable development. Going from Gatineau to Trois Rivières to go to St. Etienne-des-Grès, which is close to Shawinigan, I think that the choice of the site, and this is my personal opinion, does not respect the sustainable development criteria.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2100 (Translation) Moving on now, Ms. Linda Cronk.

MS. LINDA CRONK:

2105 Thank you, Madam; my question concerns the watchdog committee set up in Danford Lake village. I'm - my name is Linda Cronk, and I'm a full-time resident in the village of Danford Lake. This watchdog committee was then called the Environmental Management Committee, and a lot of residents and people around Danford Lake have felt they had trouble accessing this committee.

2110 And the Environmental Management Committee scheduled a public meeting for April 9th, 2006, just six (6) days following a meeting at Bethany Hall around bylaws, including rezoning, which was attended by more than two hundred (200) people, the majority of which were clearly opposed to the landfill.

2115 Given that the mandate of the Environmental Management Committee is to ensure that the residents remain informed of relevant activities and that their concerns are heard and dealt with appropriately, this meeting was an opportunity for the Environmental Management Committee to fulfil its mandate, and an opportunity for rate payers to get answers denied to them by their Mayor and council. I'd like to ask Mr. Rouleau why did they cancel it.

2120

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2125 (Translation) Mme. Chairperson, the community's executive decided to cancel that meeting. It's then that the committee decided to terminate its activities following that meeting, following some unfortunate events that happened following that large townhall assembly.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) How do you foresee the possibility of striking a committee, a watchdog

2130 committee, that would operate during the entire service life of the site that you're proposing, if the social acceptance of the community is not said and done?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2135 (Translation) With a good communication plan, it's clear that we can't get the support of the entire community for such a project. That's a given, and we never had that hope. Even we hoped that we would get people who weren't great supporters of the project, but that were still open-minded.

2140 If the starting position - and I would like nothing less than to abandon the project - no, I don't want to completely abandon the project, but faced with a person who says that, there's very little I could say. But if this person is open to finding a middle ground, then, yes, I'm completely open to it.

2145 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) But do you hope to strike a committee that will be functional and meet the expectations of the community and the government? Because we're looking at a forum that will find solutions. How do you foresee this committee? Would you change its rules? What kind of proposal can you make to make sure that that committee works?

2150

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Pardon me, Mme. Chairperson, absolutely, these watchdog committees are mandatory under the regulation, and we feel there's a need for them. And people have to partake in them with an open mind. We have to do what we can to make things work.

2155

If the residents who were there on a voluntary basis and no longer take part in a committee, it was difficult for me to tell the executive that it had to hold a meeting or that the people had to remain on the committee, but by creating a formal committee through, for example, having a representative of the municipality, of the community, of public health, if we had the necessary resources where we can answer people's questions, a series of questions, yes, absolutely, it would be a good thing.

2160

At the time, since our project was not a recognized project in the sense that it wasn't a watchdog committee that was struck through a decree, the local Environmental Ministry representative and the local public health representative were quite hesitant to sit on the committee. So, it was difficult to answer people's questions, and the people who attended or rather the members of the committee felt less and less equipped to answer people's questions.

2165

2170

We came to a point where I had to answer all the questions, and all the answers came

2175 from me. So, that wasn't a credible approach. And one has to recognize that I am the proponent. An answer that would be provided by the Public Health Ministry or the Environment Ministry would be much more credible for people. And I want to respect that. That's why the committee has to have membership from all the stakeholders involved.

MS. LINDA CRONK:

2180 The residents in the community were looking forward to this meeting that I referred to, and are now concerned to hear that this Environmental Management Committee would be the embryo or the nucleus of a vigilance committee set up in the future.

2185 If this committee is there to represent the community, why have you not answered correspondence from the community, specifically from one person who sent three (3) letters, one urging you to reschedule this meeting, April 9th meeting, so that the community could have a forum at which to ask questions and hopefully receive answers, and two (2) letters asking for information on the mandate and membership of the Environmental Management Committee in order to prepare for the BAPE hearings? And a registered letter was sent in this regard, and it was declined.

2190 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2195 (Translation) I cannot answer in the executive's name or on their behalf. If we look at the membership of different committees, the proponent or the operator is part of the executive, which we felt was inappropriate. We felt it was inappropriate for me to be part of the executive of that committee. So, the letters or requests that are mentioned in this intervention were addressed to other people. I cannot answer on their behalf.

2200 MS. LINDA CRONK:

It's a grave concern to residents to have this committee in place the way it is at present, and we would hope that, in the future, more people who have reservations about the mega dump and a lot of questions would be included, thank you.

2205 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Pierre-Louis Lafleur, he's not in the room? Mr. André Carrière.

2210 MR. ANDRE CARRIERE:

(Translation) Mme. Chairperson, Mr. Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to make the following comment before asking my question.

2215 Given the fact that Danford Lake is a small community where a few things are left unsaid and unknown, especially when there is a large project like the one that is proposed, I think it would

have been useful, especially and since - despite the fact that Mr. Rouleau was uncomfortable with the watchdog committee, he could - since he has a communication expert, he could have put more effort into explaining to the population why the watchdog committee was being withdrawn. It would have been useful for the community to understand that gesture.

2220

And I think that it came as quite an astonishing blow to the community. Having taken part in the process for the last two (2) years, everyone believed it was still in place. In my opinion, the proponent, with a little bit more attention, could have avoided a lot of aggravation within the community.

2225

Now, my question: In September, 2005, the Pontiac MRC was going to modify its residual waste management plan to modify the chapter having to do with the disposal of waste, and I quote, and this is a resolution:

2230

"The Pontiac MRC will not prohibit the dumping on its territory of non-reclaimable material coming from outside its area. This material will be disposed of in a technical landfill site possibly constructed in Danford Lake. This residual matter will have to, on a priority basis, come from four (4) MRC's in Outaouais and of the City of Gatineau. The other MRC's surrounding the Pontiac MRC's will also be able to dispose of their waste in Danford Lake, as well as any other private or public client, in so long as the authorized capacity by the Sustainable Development Ministry is met".

2235

My question is as follows. It is not specified - when you look at the word "priority" here, and when mention is made of the expression "private or public client", it is not specified where the waste would come. Might it come from outside the Outaouais region?

2240

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) We'll address the question to the MRC, the RCM, because they wrote that after all.

2245

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Pardon me, a bit of a cough here, I'm sorry. Priority, well, we are highlighting those RCM's that are in the Outaouais region and possibly the City of Gatineau. And we specify, and this is clearly mentioned in that sentence, that adjoining RCM's, those around Pontiac, might eventually export their waste to our own territory. That's Antoine Labelle as well as Argenteuil RCM. No, actually, it isn't really a neighbour of ours, but Temiscamingue, say.

2250

We're talking about three (3) or four (4) hours' worth of transportation to export their waste into our own territory. So, to all intents and purposes, the importation of waste from outside our administrative region, that of the Outaouais, is almost impossible.

2255

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2260

(Translation) Well, why did - in your management plan, did you open up to other territories? Because then there was no mention of getting royalties for the MRC to bury that waste. What was the benefit of having these large volumes on the territory of this RCM coming from outside the RCM?

2265

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

2270

(Translation) It has to be said that the number of other territories that might - that this might mean, when we talk about outside the administrative region, that of the Outaouais, there are very few, actually. So, it's a matter of geographic proximity and because of the costs of transporting the waste. So, it's mostly for the MRC's that are adjoining ours.

2275

Mont Laurier is not all that far away, in fact, from Danford Lake. What is it? Two (2) hours at most, and so, this is doable if Mont Laurier has to send their residual waste outside their region, but, in Mont Laurier, there is a sanitary landfill site. And I'll ask my colleagues from the other RCM's to tell me if I'm wrong, but there is over there a project that would consist in converting that sanitary landfill site into a TLS.

2280

So, Antoine Labelle is going down the same road to solve a problem of disposing of the waste on its own territory in the Laurentides, Marchand Canton, the municipality of - I'm trying to find the name.

MR. ANDRE CARRIERE:

2285

(Translation) L'Annonciation.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

2290

(Translation) L'Annonciation, thank you; so, in this regard, we don't see - actually, I'm not sure that those territories can send us their residual waste and even less so in the case of the Temiscamingue RCM.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2295

(Translation) A follow-up question to the gentleman from Pontiac, what you are telling us here, what you're saying, I mean the other neighbouring RCM's, are they trying to find a regional solution within each of their RCM's, or are they grouping - are they grouped together?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

2300

(Translation) Well, what we are saying is that we have a potential site - initially, it was a

2305 potential site - for a TLS as a possible alternative solution to do away with the residual waste. So, that's the way we said things to, I would say, allow the Outaouais region to find a common solution that would be useful to all of the MRC's in the region, as they try and deal with this problem. And that is why we've included those sentences in our plan.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2310 (Translation) When you mention Mont Laurier and the site over there, I mean it does meet a regional need on the part of the MRC or a group of MRC's?

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

2315 (Translation) Well, in fact, I talked with my colleague at Antoine Labelle and the people of the intermunicipal board that manage the site in Mont Laurier, and Mr. Duchesne mentioned this. There's also a site in the very same RCM, Marchand Canton, actually, Rivière Rouge. So, it's the same MRC, but that board has a number of municipalities and other municipalities from the Laurentides MRC, which is their neighbour.

2320 So, on that territory, the political will was to the effect that they would have two (2) landfill sites on the very same territory and offer services for each of the boards separately. And to the best of my knowledge, each of these two (2) will be transformed into TLS's.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2325

(Translation) To meet the needs of how many RCM's using those two (2) sites?

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

2330 (Translation) Well, if I'm talking about the board at Lalièvre, that's Mont Laurier, people will change their landfill site at any cost. We spoke about this already. If you have more waste, it is more profitable to operate that kind of site. So, it's not a matter of profitability, actually. It's a matter of managing their own waste.

2335 They approached our own RCM for us to import - to export our waste into their site. Anyway, their population is not sufficiently large to fill their own site, but they have a political will to keep it in operation nevertheless.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2340

(Translation) Thank you.

MR. ANDRE CARRIERE:

2345 (Translation) One has to understand that given this open-mindedness, it's part of the
resolution, this opens the door to a certain possibility of transporting residual waste from the
neighbouring RCM's into Pontiac, and this entails certain consequences. Over the past two (2)
days, there has been mention of the number of trucks. We spoke about volume. And, of course, if
2350 that possibility did come true, this would entail certain consequences, more consequences than
what was talked about over the past few days.

But the second part which might need a certain explanation, because it's not all together
clear for us, I mean who are those possible public or private clients that are mentioned in the
resolution?

2355

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) When we say public clients, we're talking about the municipalities, RCM's,
any organization, para-public, para-governmental body. Private, well, we're talking about
2360 entrepreneurs or companies that may want to dispose of their residual waste. It's quite simple.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And what you call industries, institutions, commerces, is that --

2365

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Yes, yes.

2370

MR. ANDRE CARRIERE:

(Translation) Well, it is said here, and they take the trouble within the text to allude to the
four (4) RCM's in the Outaouais, plus the City of Gatineau, and in the same sentence, they add "as
well as any other private or public client". So, public groups other than the four (4) RCM's and
2375 Gatineau City?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Well, as I said, this might mean any public organization. I don't have any
2380 specific examples that comes to my mind, but it might be a municipality or many municipalities or a
group of municipalities, para-public bodies, as I said, hospitals, and so forth.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2385 (Translation) Mr. Paul Dingleline.

MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

2390 Thank you, Mme. Chair; you get a little closer each time to the correct pronunciation. My name is Paul Dingledine. I'm a member of the coalition, and I have a cottage on Highway 301 just a couple of kilometres from Danford Lake.

2395 I would like, if I could, to come back to the issue of Ontario garbage, because there's still considerable confusion that surrounds this issue in our minds. We heard yesterday and today from the government representatives and from Mr. Rouleau that the import of garbage is illegal into Quebec, and we heard yesterday from Mr. Rouleau and his colleagues from Teknika of all the measures they would take to prevent this getting into the landfill.

2400 But at a council meeting about a year ago, there was a discussion with Mayor Squitti on this issue, and he mentioned that waste coming in from Ontario is - everybody knows it goes on and happens all the time, he said, quote and unquote, and there's no way of stopping it.

2405 And in a letter in the background documents to the studies done by Mr. Rouleau and Teknika, there's a letter from a Mr. Marc Dubreuil from the Ministry of the Environment, and he expresses some concern that, in order to keep the dump viable, garbage will have to be imported from Ontario. And he notes that it's hard to enforce this, this law.

2410 Well, the coalition shares this concern in a major way. And should there be any doubts in anybody's mind that garbage is coming in from Ontario in significant volumes, you need only go on any given day to the bridges in Ottawa, particularly the Chaudière Bridge and the McDonald Cartier Bridge. And over the course of a day, you will count dozens of seven (7) ton garbage trucks coming into Quebec from Ontario loaded and dozens going back empty.

2415 Now, we followed some of these trucks to find out where they were going, and they go to - and, here, I'm a little bit out of my technical depth, but they go to what appear to be kind of triage centres.

2420 And what we understand happens there is the recyclable materials are separated out from the boxes there and goes to wherever recycling materials go to. And the balance of the garbage stays in there, and we understand - these same companies, incidentally, collect garbage from Quebec sites. Indeed, if you look outside this door, that one of the big companies, Condor, has a bin just outside the door here.

2425 It is our understanding, not entirely verified, but our understanding is the balance, what is not recyclable, is basically merged with the garbage that comes from Quebec. And then, at some point, that's taken somewhere. We believe to landfills, possibly the trench landfills. Certainly, the people at the Cantley dump believe that material is coming to them from these triage centres.

2430 Now, this material travels in a Quebec truck with Quebec plates. It is picked up in Quebec, and it is dropped off in Quebec, but if there are two (2) garbage bags in the back, one may be from Ontario.

2435 My question is for the Ministry of the Environment, if we could get some clarification on exactly what the law is on this. Because our understanding, and I believe this came from the Ministry of Environment, is that if the truck comes across the border, and at least fifty percent (50%) of the contents are recyclable, then that is legal, and the balance of the garbage is accepted into Quebec. And I would just like to know: Could either the Ministry of Transport or the Ministry of Environment confirm that that is the law?

2440 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, what is imported into Quebec for reclamation is not prohibited, but as for elimination, as for disposal, that's prohibited. I'll let my colleague explain this in a more detailed fashion.

2445

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

(Translation) As Mr. Mbaraga said, importing waste for remediation is not prohibited. Of course, within that waste or within, rather, reclaimable matter, there's a certain proportion that might be, say, rejected, and then this might be disposed of in Quebec landfill sites. This is not deemed to be imported waste. We're talking about waste then that is generated in Quebec, but it's a small portion of what is not reclaimed.

2450

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2455

(Translation) Are there spot checks done on these trucks at times to make sure that these are really recyclable substances that are transported and not ultimate waste?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2460

(Translation) Well, off the bat, I would say yes, Mme. Chair, but we will be asking somebody from the region to come and explain this to you, to tell you how this kind of inspection or control is carried out.

2465 MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

(Translation) Good evening, Mme. Chair.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2470

(Translation) Good evening.

MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

2475

(Translation) Christine Boucher, I'm from the regional branch, Environmental Control. As concerns the trucks carrying recyclable substances that might be sent to the sorting centres, the promoter or the operator has to, and this is part of his certificate, has to check what this waste is all about. He must look at the entrance point and see if the garbage coming in is accepted for his sorting centre. There is also inspections that are done in the part of the Ministry to make sure that

2480

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2485

(Translation) But how do you determine that the trucks coming from Ontario are all going to sorting centres?

MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

2490

(Translation) That's a good question. Do they all go to sorting centres? Well, that's a hard one. We would need to have people on the bridges, but as Mr. Bourret said, it is true that what is done - reclaimable waste from Ontario are acceptable and what is left over is disposed of in Quebec.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2495

(Translation) And there's a certain percentage here. On average, what is it?

MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

2500

(Translation) I have one sorting centre in my mind. We'd have to check what their registers tell us, their records, and see what the percentages are, how much of that waste is disposed of. We know that there are sites that are used by that promoter, but what are the proportions, we'd have to look into this.

2505

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) So, the gentleman's apprehensions might be founded is what you're saying.

MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

2510

(Translation) Well, it is legal. That waste can come into Quebec to be reclaimed, and the

waste from these sorting centres, if they're sent to a dry matter landfill claim, of course, they have to meet the definition to go there. That is doable. And very often it is, of course, usually a dry waste on which we perform sorting operations.

2515

Might I, since I have the mike, mention a bit of a nuance? Mr. Poulin said earlier on that the Ministry of Sustainable Development, the Environment, and Parks tolerates the dumping entrenches to burn their garbage, their waste, even though this is prohibited.

2520

Well, I'm part of the regional branch, and I can guarantee that we - when we get a complaint or if we're on the road and see smoke coming out of one of those sites, the municipality, because mostly it is municipalities that are owners and operate these, they are told that this is a problem, and sometimes this goes to the Courts. This is something that we do at our level, at my level, where I work, and we don't tolerate this.

2525

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Are there often complaints?

2530

MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

(Translation) We've had a few. There were a few cases. It isn't all that run of the mill. I would say that, oh, maybe we had ten (10) or so complaints out of a total of fifty (50) sites where they do dumping entrenches. I would have expected way more. Possibly, it's because people don't know, or they've gotten used to it. They've been burning these for a long time, and the regulation in this regard was adopted in 1977, if memory serves.

2535

And the dumping entrenches have always burned the waste, and people were used to seeing what we used to call dumps burning things. So, maybe it's in people's minds. I mean maybe they do not know that this is now prohibited as of the 19th of January, 2006.

2540

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) How frequently are they covered over in these trenches?

2545

MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

(Translation) We ask that this be done only in June, July, August, and September, once a week, that they cover the waste, because it's summertime, and this might bring about vermin. The rest of the time, we say that the trench has to be covered when the - when it's full, at the level of rest of the soil. There isn't much more additional control. There are trenches and the waste goes into it.

2550

THE COMMISSIONER:

2555

(Translation) ...So, it's a great place for the gulls, a great place for the gulls.

MS. CHRISTINE BOUCHER:

2560

(Translation) Well, I've carried out inspections, and it isn't all that frequent. I haven't visited many of these sites for a while now. I'm mostly in the office now, but it didn't used to be all that much of a problem. I'd have to check with the technician, however, but it isn't mentioned as a problem by the inspectors.

2565

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2570

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; over the past months now especially, we see less of this being done. The tariffs for these trenches have gone way up. The cost has gone up. And, therefore, the distance for those businesses becomes a major component. And prices, cost, I mean, or the tariffs by these dumps that do things in trenches are similar to the cost of doing this in Ontario, where there are many landfill sites, especially around Ottawa. So, the benefit is not all that great anymore, and it's going down.

2575

MR. PAUL DINGELDINE:

2580

Very briefly, Mme. Chair, the Ministry of the Environment says that small proportion is included or permitted of non-recyclable materials. Unfortunately, I do not have it in front of me, but I do believe we have an e-mail from the Ministry of Environment that says fifty percent (50%) is the rule.

2585

We also have comments, second-hand comments - so, you take them for what they're worth - from people in the industry, who say there's no problem getting garbage into Quebec. Take your garbage and throw a couple of tin cans in the back. You're okay.

2590

I think the source of our worry, and I'll leave, the source of our worry, of course, is because the people who are behind the dump are Ontario construction companies and demolition companies, and Mr. Rouleau worked in Ontario. The whole thing is Ontario behind this. And this gives us great cause for concern, because the law, first of all, is fairly relaxed. And so far as we know, the enforcement of it is even more relaxed. Thank you very much.

2595 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) You will no doubt deal with this issue in your brief, sir.

2600 MR. PAUL DINGELDINE:

Indeed, we will.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2605 (Translation) Thank you; there's still many people's names on the register. I'll ask these people if they expect to be coming in tomorrow, if we have to go on and meet again tomorrow. We still have thirty-five (35) minutes. There's still many names on the register. So, may I have sheet number 11, please? I would like sheet number 11.

2610 Ms. Mary Lee de Lombard, are you here? No, Ms. Michèle Borchers; Ms. Alexandra Pritchard, will you be here tomorrow? You will attend tomorrow, thank you. Mr. Jacques Demers? No, Ms. Jeanne or Jane Bayner, Bauer, she's not here; Mr. Ray Thomas; Mr. Renato Livinal; Mr. John Edwards; Mr. Ed Masotti, not here; Ms. Mary Masotti. Ms. Sue Rogan, you will be in attendance tomorrow. Mr. Gilles Pelletier, you cannot come tomorrow? Alright.

2615 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Gilles Pelletier. Here is my question. LDC went ahead and dug wells to do tests. I'd like to know who gave them the authorization to do this.

2620 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, when the directive on the part of the Ministry of the Environment was given, there was a - we started the process, actually, to carry out the impact study in line with the Minister's instructions.

2630 So, there was a request, an official request, sent to the Ministry of Natural Resources done by Ogilvy Renault to be allowed to go ahead to do the work, and comply with what the Minister said that we had to for the impact study, do the impact study characterization, and comply with the regulations and all the parameters of the hydrological studies, so, to dig wells, to characterize the site where potentially the landfill site would be built.

2635 MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) Well, very well, I'd like to inform the commission now that I found over the

Internet today that the site chosen by LDC is mostly under claims with valid active mining titles. What does this mean?

2640 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do we have a representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Fauna?

2645 MR. LAURENT MASSICOTTE:

(Translation) I'm not aware of what the gentleman has said, and I'm not familiar with that kind of issue. I could seek out information. What I do know is that any person, individual, or company, or whatever, can, over the Internet, reserve or stake a claim anywhere, all throughout
2650 the province. This person might be living in China and stake a claim. So, this is a right, and there are obligations that come with this kind of claim, but I can't be saying much more. It's a matter that I'm not really familiar with.

2655 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Very well, perhaps then you could look into this and see what this might entail, the fact that this land has - is the object of a number of claims, because we were told, I believe, yesterday that this is one of the parameters that have to be taken into account, when there is a proposal to rent or to acquire land that is Crown land. So, the issue is whether or not there are
2660 land...

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

(Translation) Mining claims, and this gives the prospector access to whatever is
2665 underneath the surface.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) We would like to get an answer in writing later on.
2670

MR. LAURENT MASSICOTTE:

(Translation) Very well.

2675 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Is that alright?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2680

(Translation) Yes, thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2685

(Translation) Was your last question?

MR. GILLES PELLETIER:

2690

(Translation) Yes.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2695

(Translation) Thank you; Mme. Stephanie Milford, we'll wait for you then. Please come forward.

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

2700

My name is Stephanie Milford, and I live about two (2) kilometres away from this proposed mega dump site. I have two (2), maybe three (3) questions, and one for the board as well. I'd like to know how Mr. Rouleau is going to keep birds, rats, whatever kind of animals that live in the wilderness away from the dump, because other animals will eat those animals, and we hunt animals. Therefore, something is going to happen. Somebody is going to get sick.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2705

(Translation) If I understand correctly, you're wondering what the impact will be on the food chain.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2710

(Translation) Yes.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2715

(Translation) I don't believe, if we look at the food chain, seagulls are eaten by prey animals which could be coyotes, foxes. I'm not an expert in biology. However, I do have a specialist in fauna, but he's not here. From what I know, my general knowledge, there are also bears that could eat these vermin.

2720

So, I'm looking at the animals that humans eat that could come from the bottom of the

food chain. Seagulls could be eaten by prey animals, such as prey birds maybe or - but to end up in the human food chain or in the human's food. So, we're coming back tomorrow. I'll make sure that I know which animals end up on our plate, because I'm not sure that I can answer the question properly.

2725

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment, and Parks, do you have a supplementary answer?

2730

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) We never - I've never heard of anything like that, and it's not the first technical landfill site we assess. I've been dealing with this in twelve (12) years, and I've never heard of this problem before. It's the first time it has been raised.

2735

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

But you're saying it can happen.

2740

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) I'm sorry, I didn't understand what you said.

2745

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

I said but you do say it can happen.

2750

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) No, that is not what I said. I said that since we've been analyzing this kind of file, Mme. Chairperson, no one has ever raised this concern, and it has never been part of the impact studies. There has never been that kind of issue emanating from a TLS. None of these animals have been assessed in that manner, that they would end up in the human plate.

2755

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) But we're talking about land animals here. We're going to talk about aquatic animals now. Are there any experts here that could answer your question? If you could come forward to the table to tell us if the controls for discharge are established to take aquatic life into account? For fish, I'm thinking.

2760

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

2765 (Translation) I'll throw my gum out, pardon me. I wasn't expecting to have to intervene. My name is Carole Lachapelle. I wasn't expecting the question. I'm somewhat surprised.

2770 I would say that what could influence the quality of water is the leachate water, the leachate on which there are standards and very severe quality criteria. And these quality criteria, for many of them, although all uses are considered, a lot of these criteria deal with aquatic life protection and the consumption of fish. So, I don't see that there would be a problem. Perhaps I'm misunderstanding the problem.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2775 (Translation) Right, well, could you explain then what are the criteria for discharge that involve the food chain, especially the aquatic life that we eat?

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

2780 (Translation) The quality criteria that we have at the Environment Ministry aim at protecting all uses upstream of the discharge. It could be for swimming, drinking, aquatic life, eating fish, etc. Those are our criteria. So, when we have contaminants in the effluent or that could potentially be in the effluent, we select those criteria, and we demand that the effluent meet the discharge criteria that are there to protect the use, or if the environment is degraded, to recover them. And that's a bit how it works.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2790 (Translation) Since you're there, there are standards for leachate concentrate discharge, and there is also criteria or goals to meet. Could the same parameter be regulated by a standard and also be a criteria for the receiving environment?

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

2795 (Translation) Yes, obviously.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2800 (Translation) Which of the two (2) is most severe?

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

(Translation) It always differs according to the project, because we don't always have the

2805 same parameters, because the discharge goals are not like the standards in the sense that they vary.

For example, zinc, which is the metal dealt with in the regulation, it's zero point seven (0.7) milligrams per litre. That's the average we're aiming for. Whatever the site may be, whatever the
2810 TLS may be, that value never changes. For the pH, it's between six point zero (6.0) and nine point five (9.5); for coliform, a hundred (100) coliform per hundred (100) or two hundred (200) millilitre. I don't know them all by heart.

For the seven (7) parameters that are the object of a standard, these do not vary, because
2815 they have been determined by tried and true methods. If we feel - we feel that if we use the best possible technology, we can meet those values. Whether the TLS is in Abitibi, whether it's in Montérégie, whether it's in Gaspésie, we will always have the same standards. Now, these basic standards are completed.

If the proponent doesn't meet the values, he has a problem. So, we add to this the review
2820 of what could potentially be found in the leachate. And I'm talking about potentially be found, and this is hypothetical, because our criteria list with which we create discharge objectives are very comprehensive. We have very wide-based lists, but with the new methods, those lists may be reduced, but as a starting point, we went as broad as possible.

2825 So, we have metals involved in here. We have conventionals, as we call them. We have particles, organic material. We have stylytes, benzene, mercury, PCB. That doesn't mean that they're in the effluent, but we kept them in the list. We look at what environment the effluent flows into.

2830 To simplify things, an effluent that would be five thousand (5,000) square metres per day and that would flow into a small area would have very severe discharge criteria.

Now, in the current case, to have a ballpark figure, this effluent represents at the most two
2835 hundred forty (240) square metres a day, and which will be diluted in a hundred eighty thousand (180,000) square metres a day. Monique has the figures. She can correct me if I'm wrong. And that hundred eighty thousand (180,000) square metres a day, which is the dilution of the effluent, is not on an average flow, but a very low flow, which happens only one (1) out of ten (10) years. So, the two hundred forty-one (241) square metres that dilute into a hundred eighty thousand (180,000)
2840 square metres are the basis for our discharge objectives. This is how we work.

So, if we discharge in the Picanoc River in an agricultural stream, the values differ, contrary to the standards, where the standards cannot vary. We tell the proponent this is the technology that has been tried and tested. Your treatment has to meet those values, whereas

2845 the objectives are more nuanced. We don't know if these parameters will be found in significant values.

Now, once we do have the environmental objectives for discharge, we compare them to the quality of the effluent. And if there is a problem for one (1) or two (2) parameters, we say, for
2850 example, the proponent will have to improve, readjust, or propose solutions. That's how it works.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) When you say that you compare them to the data the proponent gives you,
2855 are those parameters the object of a follow-up, a regular follow-up, or sampling?

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

(Translation) Not regular such as the standards that are measured every week, and that's
2860 a very ambitious follow-up. Personally, I find that, as compared to other projects, this kind of follow-up is more than sufficient. However, discharge objectives are a series of parameters and some involving very little values. In fact, they're called ultra trace in the sense that very few laboratories can conduct that kind of analysis, because it's so sophisticated. The detection limits we require are very, very little.

2865 So, up until now, the parameters were measured twice a year, but we are looking at increasing that to three (3) times a year for TLS's that have an annual effluent which is new, to my knowledge. I haven't done a lot of TLS's, but some TLS only work six (6) to seven (7) months a year, because the water is too cold in the winter or such type of reason, but some TLS's warm their
2870 water to have year-round activities. And that's why there is permanent discharge, and that's why we increase the assessment to three (3) times a year.

And I would bring the following nuance. If there is an objective that is surpassed, then the proponent has to increase the number of analyses to see if this is a one-off instance, or if it
2875 happens more than once. This is part of the decrees.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Are those parameters on these contaminants stable normally in the effluent,
2880 or do they fluctuate, and why would they fluctuate?

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

(Translation) I haven't seen results very often with - treatment very often. In fact, I think
2885 we're only starting to compile the data. However, what I did see, because we wondered about phenols, and these are present in TLS's, for three (3) of these phenols.

2890 In fact, I looked at the data that Michel Bourret, my colleague, gave me and in the untreated water there present, and it fluctuates from one TLS to the other, but once the water is treated, very often it's below the detection level. So, the treatment has worked. But why does it fluctuate? It depends on the type of waste. It depends on a series of things that I couldn't explain now.

2895 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Could it happen that the treatment doesn't do its job accidentally for a reason or another, and is there a red flag then, so that the operator can intervene, or can there be a long period of time before somebody finds out?

2900 MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

2905 (Translation) Well, off the top of my head and I reread the document, I think, and they'll correct me if I'm wrong, because I didn't examine it, but in case of a problem, I think that there are accumulation pools. And as far as I know, that storage basin, for three hundred (300) square metres, could store more than a month and a half, fifty (50) days' worth of leachate. I think it's fifteen thousand (15,000) square metres. Is that it? So, there is a way of retaining the leachate water until the system is repaired.

2910 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) My question for Mr. Rouleau is: Could the fault be detected quickly, and what parameters are measured on a continuous basis and would allow quick intervention, if the standards is exceeded?

2915 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) I'll let Mr. Gagnon answer.

2920 MR. YVES GAGNON:

(Translation) As you mentioned, Mr. Commissioner, and as Mme. Lachapelle said, we must verify the seven (7) parameters that are the object of a standard every week. So, when we get the results, if we see that one of those parameters is exceeded, obviously a red flag is raised, and the intervention plan is put in place.

2925 As Mme. Lachapelle said, and I'll repeat it, in this case, there is a storage basin that is provided for, should we have to store water, if there were an occasional problem.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2930

(Translation) I'll ask you the question in another way. You say that you measure the parameters weekly, but if, on the first day after the measurement, the system crashes or something happens, you will see that problem only a week later.

2935

MR. YVES GAGNON:

(Translation) The parameters take a little bit of time to be analyzed, and the longest one is - takes five (5) days. And that parameter then takes five (5) days, which is longer than the other was. The other ones are analyzed much quicker. So, normally, it would take, I would say, two (2) days to have the results.

2940

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) But that was not my question. You collect your sample. You get the results five (5) days later and some other parameters two (2) days later, but, for a full week, you are not sampling. And if the equipment crashes, you will know one week plus two (2) days or plus five (5) days later.

2945

MR. YVES GAGNON:

(Translation) Yes, but as I said earlier, if we see that, we can store the water. As well, if we have a doubt, because, you know, it comes with experience. People who work with water treatment, whether it's industrial water or water from a dump, these people have experience and know when the problem or a break happens. And that's when they kick into gear, or they can preventively start storing the water or make more regular analyses and adjust as they go along.

2950

2955

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) But there are no parameters that you measure on a continuous basis that would show you any abnormality. There's nothing that you measure on a continuous basis.

2960

MR. YVES GAGNON:

(Translation) As Mr. Poulin said, there could be a particle in suspension. Perhaps we could have one (1) or two (2) parameters that we would measure more frequently such as suspended particulates, but I think the regulation was implemented to ensure that if we have a weekly follow-up, which is far more frequent than what is done in traditional waste landfills, our follow-up is nearly continuous. It's a very comprehensive follow-up program.

2965

2970 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

2975 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, to summarize, the parameters that are taken into consideration and the requirements that tie into these parameters take the environment into consideration, to avoid any accumulation in the river that would cause damage to health.

2980 MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

(Translation) Yes.

2985 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Are you only talking about standardized parameters?

MS. CAROLE LACHAPELLE:

2990 (Translation) Yes, all uses are taken into account when we set discharge objectives. In this case, our objectives are less severe than the regulations or the standards.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2995 (Translation) Any other question?

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

3000 Yes, we all smell the smell that comes from the Carp dump, and we all know what happened in Cantley. People are sick or animals got sick, and some died. So, my question is a two (2) part question: When we get sick or hurt at your dump, Mr. Rouleau, or our animals get sick or we get sick, will you pay our medical bills, because you brought this dump to our town? And I ask you to answer, please.

3005 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Could you answer the question, please?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

3010 (Translation) We will follow the regulation very thoroughly.

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

3015 No, the question was: Will you pay for our medical bills?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3020 (Translation) Should there be damage to health or to property of any nature, what would happen?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

3025 (Translation) Well, obviously, if the responsibility on our part is demonstrated, we have insurance, and this insurance is there to cover this kind of situation, so, in that sense, yes, but by following the regulations in a very comprehensive and thorough manner, there should not be any problems.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3030 (Translation) We have five (5) minutes.

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

3035 (Translation) When Mr. Rouleau began the process of creating his dump, he went to the people in our community, the people in Danford, and he even said to me that I could work at his dump. What do you think of that? I don't know how that's said in French, but a bribe. What do you think of that?

3040 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) I wasn't there.

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

3045 I'm asking for your opinion.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3050 (Translation) I cannot do that. I cannot give you an opinion on that. We're investigating. We're listening to people, and we will write a report explaining what we felt about what we heard.

MS. STEPHANIE MILFORD:

3055 Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) We have five (5) minutes left. We'll take one last question, a brief one.

3060

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

(Translation) Mme. Chairperson...

3065

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Eight (8) people are still on the list. Amongst those eight (8) people, you know who you are, I won't name you, who cannot come - yes?

3070

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

(Translation) Mme. Chairperson, she raised something very important, and tomorrow I'd like to speak to what happened in Cantley two (2), three (3) years ago. This is part of the collective memory. We don't have time to talk about it today. We have to talk about the odour problems in Cantley. I can summarize.

3075

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Madam will not be there tomorrow. So, maybe you could explain.

3080

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

(Translation) I want you to understand, because, in fact, there were odour problems, and they were quite severe. It was a catastrophic problem, really, and I'll explain quickly. This was an improperly managed waste dump that included gyproc, and there was a beginning of a fire. It was doused.

3085

The material became damp, and the bacteria of the sulphurous material began degrading. Because of the sulphur, the H₂S started emanating. And because it's on a slope, the houses at the bottom of the slope were - found themselves in a very uncomfortable situation for a year and a half or two (2) years.

3090

And people in the Outaouais region are now associating the Danford Lake problem with the Cantley problem, but the big problem that was in Cantley was that there is no methane. And since there's no methane, we can't burn anything. If we could have methane, we could burn H₂S at the same time. And that shouldn't be the case at the TLS in Danford.

3095

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

3100 (Translation) Very well, so, we'll come back to that issue tomorrow, and we'll see. We have eight (8) people on the list remaining and two (2) minutes left. If one person amongst those eight (8) people on page 12 cannot come tomorrow, please table your question, and we will deal with it tomorrow morning. We'll pose it in your place.

3105 I think this closes the hearing for tonight. We will be starting again tomorrow at nine (9:00) here, yes, and we will have to finish at twelve (12:00) noon at the latest. So, rest well, and we'll see you tomorrow.

3110

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.

3115

AND I HAVE SIGNED:

3120

ANNAGRET RINALDI,
Official Court Reporter.