

**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 6

Hearing held May 18, 2007, 9 h
Cathédrale Saint-Jean-Marie-Vianney
160, rue Bruchési
Gatineau

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS..... 2

QUESTION PERIOD :

MICHÈLE BORCHERS 8

ALEXA PRITCHARD 14

RAY THOMAS 17

RENATO LIVINAL 22

JOHN EDWARDS 24

RECESS 32

OTA HORA 32

ED MASOTTI 36

MARY MASOTTI 39

SUE ROGAN 41

LINDA CRONK (FOR ANNIE PECK) 42

GEORGE McCORMICK 43

LINDA CRONK 44

LINDA CRONK (FOR DOROTHY MACKAY) 46

ANDRÉ CARRIÈRE 47

PAUL DINGLEDINE 47

MICHÈLE BORCHERS (FOR LAURA RAYMOND) 51

JACQUES RAYMOND 52

MICHÈLE BORCHERS 58

OTA HORA 59

GEORGE McCORMICK 61

JACQUES RAYMOND 61

MS. CLAUDETTE JOURNAULT,
THE CHAIRWOMAN:

5

(Translation) Good morning, everybody, welcome to our sixth public hearing relating to the setting up of a technical landfill site at Alleyn-and-Cawood, in the municipality of Alleyn-and-Cawood. It's the Danford Lake project. I'll be better in a few minutes.

10

So, we still have quite a few numbers in our register. The register will remain open until nine thirty (9:30). So, you can sign up. If you have other questions, you can write them down and send them to us by Tuesday. Those questions, by then, become property of the commission, just like public hearings, and the commission will decide if answers have already been provided or not. If so, the answers can be found in the transcripts, and we can also get additional information and complete the questions.

15

The resource persons could get in touch with the authors of those questions in order to make sure that they understand what you want, what is the point of your question or your concern, in order to get the right answers.

20

So, without further ado, we're going to ask the developer to introduce the members of his team and to tell us if he has additional documents for us or any other information.

25

Then, we'll do the same thing with the resource persons. We'll ask them if they have additional documents or if they have more information about the documents they have provided, and we'll ask them to tell us if they will have additional information to provide us later on. I know that some commitments have been made about several questions or concerns, and some additional information will come up next week, I'm quite sure.

30

And also people in the room, if you come and table some documents, we'll ask you to introduce your documents or tell us or summarize what they are. That would be useful for getting answers.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

35

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, my name is Denis Rouleau. I'm the C.E.O. of LDC Management and Environmental Services. I'm with André Poulin, engineer and responsible of the company Teknika HBA. He is with his experts, Yves Gagnon and Patrick Gagnon. As far as documents are concerned, yes, we will provide you with additional documents as soon as they are available.

40

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

45 (Translation) Thank you; good morning, the documents we will provide are further to the questions asked yesterday.

50 First, I would ask a slight delay to the commission, because yesterday we finished quite late, and the calculations required about the number of trucks takes a bit more time. It's based on the period of seven (7:00) a.m. to six (6:00) p.m. and not a twenty-four (24) hour period, and we could not do those calculations during the night. I suppose you will understand.

55 So, we would ask for your indulgence to be able to do that next week and give you the information as soon as we get it, because we don't have the information on hand this morning to do those calculations. So, we'll start working on that at the beginning of next week.

60 The same thing about the issue of noise and the methodology and why the Ministry of Transport uses the twenty-four (24) hour method, when we work on an eleven (11) hour period, but that is the methodology of the Ministry of Transport. We'll have to explain why the Ministry of Transport operates that way.

65 The other thing relates to the food chain. We looked at that early this morning. We looked with a search engine among scientific data bases. We found the information, and we checked it with our specialist in biology. And so, there is a document that is very comprehensive.

70 It's a study that has been done by French organizations in France relating to waste warehousing and public trails, and it includes lots of recommendations about all the risk factors, the matters of transfer, the problems of landfill sites related to public health. We're going to table this document before the commission. It is a rather exhaustive comprehensive study. It is very interesting, and I'm sure it will be an important source of information for the people concerned.

75 I glanced at it, especially the issues relating to the food chain, and each time there was an environmental risk, it was related to the trench sites, not to the landfill site as such. So, those trench sites have a risk, because there is no compacting of the waste, and the only information we could find relating to that, related to those trench filling sites. In our case, there will be a high rate of compacting. There will be operating twice a day. And according to the study, there was no risk of illness, of transmission of illnesses through the food chain.

80 And I think those were the three (3) things pending at the end of the day yesterday. That's all for us.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Now, on the other side, we'll ask you to introduce yourselves. And if you

85 have any documents to table, please do so.

MR. JACQUES HENRY:

90 (Translation) I'm Jacques Henry. I'm representing the Transportation Ministry. Yesterday, we were asked to provide statistics relating to accidents on the parts of 105 and 301 that will be used by the trucks that will deliver waste to the site. The analysis is being done today, and the results for the period 2001 to 2005 will be provided. We'll include results for 2006 also.

95 And so, we'll get that by the end of the day or by Tuesday morning, and it will be given to your analysts. And the data will be compared with the data in the strategic plan of the Ministry. We're talking about the plan 2001/2005. And there will be a comparison with the rest of the province to see if the results that we have obtained about the 105 are similar to those for other roads in Quebec.

100 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you.

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

105 (Translation) Good morning, Catherine Lussier.

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

110 (Translation) Louis-Marie Poissant, Public Health branch in the Outaouais, I have a document. I've tabled twelve (12) copies at the back of the room. Further to various questions of citizens relating to the committee, the existing committee, I referred to a document. It's watchdog committees linked to landfill sites in Quebec. It has been prepared by the Quebec Common Front for Ecological Management of Waste, and it's related to the sorting centre of Lachenaie.

115 So, I don't want to presume about the conclusions of the commission, but if you were to authorize the site, I think there should be a good watchdog committee. And so, that's why I came up with this document and left it here for interested people.

120 MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Good morning, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, Pierre Duchesne of the Pontiac RCM, I would like to correct a few things relating to the intervention of Mr. André Carrière of the coalition relating to the adding of a paragraph in our management plan of waste,

relating to the importation of waste matter from outside. The paragraph says this:

125

"The regional municipality of Pontiac will not forbid the importation of waste from outside its territory. That waste could be eliminated or disposed of later on in our landfill site that could be set up on its territory. That waste will come primarily from the four (4) municipalities in the Outaouais and from Gatineau. As far as the other municipalities are concerned, they could also use that land site for their waste, as long as the capacity authorized in the Government of Quebec order is respected".

130

So, first, I wondered where the matter of private and public clients came from, since it was not in the change that we had brought to the management plan of waste.

135

Also, I got a bit lost geographically yesterday. The Labelle regional committee is not the neighbouring community. The neighbouring communities are the Collines of Outaouais, the Gatineau regional municipality - they're part of the Outaouais region - and also Temiscamingue and Vallée-de-l'Or in the Abitibi-Temiscamingue region, north and west.

140

So, to follow from what I said yesterday, the importation of waste would not come from Antoine Labelle or even Argenteuil through Lachute, but from Abitibi-Temiscamingue. And, geographically speaking, the first municipality close to the Vallée-de-l'Or is Val d'Or, and Val d'Or is a huge municipality which is at more than four hundred fifty (450) kilometres from the Danford Lake landfill site.

145

As for the Temiscamingue, the first municipality is the municipality of Temiscamingue, twenty-eight hundred (2,800) persons, and it is located at about - well, at more than three hundred (300) kilometres, but, between Temiscamingue and the other municipality, St. Edouard-de-Fort, close to Ville Marie, there is a distance of about seventy-five (75) kilometres.

150

So, when one talks about importing waste, one has to consider that it would be enormous transportation costs, if those regions want to export their waste to the projected landfill site.

155

So, those were the corrections and the additional information I wanted to provide. About the change brought to the waste management plan, that is part of the documents I tabled yesterday.

MR. BERNARD CHARTRAND:

160

(Translation) Bernard Chartrand, I'm with the Municipal Affairs Ministry.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

165

(Translation) Jean Mbaraga, I'm the spokesman of the Sustainable Development

Ministry, Environment, and Parks. I'm with Mr. Michel Bourret relating to policies, relating to waste matters. And in the room, there's Monique Beauchamps and Carole Lachapelle, who are also ready to answer questions, if need be.

170 You had asked, Mme. Chair, if or what were the steps taken at Ste. Sophie to reduce the number of gulls, seagulls. I don't know that. So, I'll try to get the answer by the break or during the break.

MR. LAURENT MASSICOTTE:

175 (Translation) Good morning, Mme. Chair, I am Laurent Massicotte of the Natural Resources Ministry, and Patrick Autotte is in the room with me.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

180 (Translation) Now, about the resource persons who have been introduced, could you please go to a microphone and introduce yourselves? Has anyone not been introduced who is a resource person? No, alright, is there someone from Allevyn-and-Cawood municipality? Yes.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

185 (Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; I only wanted you to give me the right to answer Pierre Duchesne's statement. He has read the resolution as it had been passed by the Pontiac regional municipality.

190 The problem is that the text we have is the text that was provided by LDC in their impact study, and I find it a bit strange that, in the text provided by LDC, the expression "lieu d'enfouissement in Pontiac" is replaced by "lieu d'enfouissement at Danford Lake". And also, they say that they could accept any other public or private clients. So, there is a difference between the resolution passed or the way it has been understood by LDC and the way it has been passed by the municipality.

195 So, this is a legal issue that is important. It doesn't change anything to the fact that, grammatically speaking, if I say in French that I invite four (4) or five (5) persons in private to my table, if there is a waiting line, and there is enough room, the other people can come up, right? That's what it means.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

200 (Translation) Mme. Chair, I remember quite clearly that when we were developing the impact study, that information or at least the management plan had not been adopted by the Ministry, by Mr. Mulcair. So, for us, it was a proposal for a resolution, because the resolution

210 had not been approved by the Ministry and by the Minister of the Environment. And since we were working and we were in a process, that was the text that was provided to us. And, obviously, there has been a gap between the two (2).

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

215 (Translation) So, what is legal is the statement in the management plan.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

220 (Translation) Yes, in French, it doesn't change anything, because if they talk about as a priority, that opens the doors to others. That's what I mean.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Any other clarifications about documents?

225 MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

230 (Translation) Mme. Chair, please, the waste management plan is a general plan that has been passed by resolution. So, it is a political decision, and a resolution can be cancelled or replaced by another, which means that the plan could be changed, if there was any ambiguity in the text about this matter.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

235 (Translation) So, in that case, it has to go back to the Minister, I suppose, the Municipal Affairs Minister.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

240 (Translation) Yes, each change to the management plan has to be approved by the Minister of the Environment.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

245 (Translation) Municipal Affairs or Environment?

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

250 (Translation) Environment, yes, since the management plan has been developed according to the Act on the Quality of the Environment that is administered by the Ministry of the Environment.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Alright.

255

MR. ED MASOTTI:

Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, the coalition this morning has tabled the raw information on traffic accidents from Wakefield all the way up to the 105 and down the 301 to the dump. We've also provided - this is from --

260

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Please, could you show the map with the roads? Now, do you want to be ready to show the roads? We'll give you a pointer.

265

MR. ED MASOTTI:

Okay, if you don't mind my shaking hands...

270

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Well, it will be in accordance with my brain.

275

MR. ED MASOTTI:

Basically, it's from here all the way up to here to there. It may go a little right past, because we've broken it down into the four (4) jurisdictions: Chelsea, La Pêche, Low, and Kazabazua. The accidents though are on the 103 or the 305 for those four (4) jurisdictions. It may go a little lower than Wakefield also. There might be some accidents at Tulip Valley, but the vast majority of the accidents on 105 are from Wakefield to Kazabazua, okay.

280

So, we've provided a little summary. We've given you the current contact in Transport Canada that you can consult with. We've given you the previous contact also that you can consult with, hopefully, who gave all of this information to us. We have provided everything in electronic copy and in hard copy. As I said, we've provided the hard or the raw data, but we've also provided the coalition summary, a one-page summary, detailing all of the accidents on the 105. We haven't done it yet for the 301, okay.

285

290

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you; the Ministry of Transport, when possible, could you give us

some information about the speed limits? Are there parts where there are special problems? So, what are the present speed limits, if you can give us that next week?

295

MR. JACQUES HENRY:

(Translation) Alright, we've taken note of that.

300

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, we have - you still have three (3) minutes to sign up. Then, the register will be closed, and we'll call people. First, Mr. Pierre-Louis Lafleur, he's not here; Mrs. Mary Lee de Lombard; Mrs. Michèle Borchers.

305

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, Commissioner, Michèle Borchers, I would like to have a clarification from the Environment Ministry about the management fund for after the closing of the site. Several times yesterday it was said that the citizens don't have to be concerned, because there would be a fund that would last thirty (30) years after the closure of the site. And so, if there was a problem of pollution, the promoter would be held liable.

310

But if I read the act correctly, there is a clause stating that if, during the five (5) years after the closing, there is no trace of pollution from the tests, then the promoter stops being held liable. Is it a correct interpretation or not?

315

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; I do not think that is exact. After five (5) years, if there is no trace of pollution based on the results of ground water, for instance, if, after five (5) years, they haven't gone over the standards, we can eliminate the obligation to do tests and studies, but that does not change the liability.

320

325

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) I'm sorry, it's not quite clear.

330

MR. DONALD LABRIE,
THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Mr. Mbaraga, the regulation states that after the closing after thirty (30) years, if, for five (5) years, the next five (5) years, the tests carried out demonstrate that none of

335 the standards - there is no problem compared to the standards, then the Ministry can free the
developer from the liability. So, the fund, the trust fund, is active for five (5) years just to make
sure that those tests are carried out.

340 But after that five (5) year period, after the end, after the closure, if there is no problem
with the standards, is the present owner allowed to sell the land, for instance, and dispose of it as
he wishes?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

345 (Translation) As far as selling the land or using the land, it's regulated by Clause 65 or 45
of the act. I'll let my colleague Michel explain that to you.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

350 (Translation) As concerns the sale now, no matter when this might occur, the lot can be
sold, but there are a certain number of obligations that come with this, that would be sold and
purchased at the very same time. So, whoever buys the property will become liable for the whole
land and for the follow-up and for sticking to the standards.

THE COMMISSIONER:

355 (Translation) Now, of course, the owner might sell his property while it's still in operation.
However, the new owner, and this is what you're telling us, would have to buy the very same
obligations. The obligations are transferred to the new owner.

360 However, coming back to the five (5) year period after shutdown, you're saying that he
could, of course, sell his property, but are there limitations to the kind of use that can be made of
this property for a while, or are there no limitations in this respect?

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

365 (Translation) Well, as for use after shutdown, if other activities such as construction or
developing a part, all of that is possible at any point in time, actually, but there are limitations or
restrictions. It is, in fact, Section 65 that poses these limitations, and the Minister's authorization
is required. And certain activities such as residential constructions are prohibited, if there is the
370 production of biogas beyond a certain limit.

375 However, in terms of creating a park, for instance, that would be possible as of the
shutdown, given the fact that even though the site is still being active and operational and
producing leachates or methane, this does not prevent the development of a park, but other
activities such as construction, there might be limitations in that instance.

THE COMMISSIONER:

380 (Translation) And who would be delivering the permits for this kind of use after the shutdown?

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

385 (Translation) The Ministry of the Environment.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) The Minister of the Environment.

390 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

395 (Translation) Yes, however, I think that, with all due respect, I think that I haven't received an answer to my question. My question is: If, indeed, the tests are good, say, five (5) years after shutdown, and legal liability does not apply anymore, so to speak, and six (6) years after the fact, there is pollution, then who is liable? The promoter is not liable anymore, if I'm understanding this correctly. So, would it be the RCM?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

400 (Translation) Well, if the Ministry freed the promoter from this responsibility or liability and something occurs after the fact, it will be up to the Ministry.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

405 (Translation) The Ministry, well, but the land will be owned by somebody in the private sector. How will the government be held accountable?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

410 (Translation) Pardon me, pardon me, let's go through this once again. I would like to understand this. The thirty (30) year period now, what are we talking about? Thirty (30) years, does this still apply?

415 The site is a seven (7) year period. Other permits are ten (10) year permits. Well, first of all, this is a government decree, initially, that determines the basic parameters for operating, for managing the site. And this permit or this decree might limit to seven (7) or ten (10) years the period, I mean, depending on the government's will, alright.

420 Now, let's come up with a scenario here. You have a site somewhere in Quebec. There's
a decree allowing operation to occur over seven (7) years, for instance. If the owner wants to
develop further, wants a larger site, he has to develop a new project. Tell me if I'm wrong now.
Stop me if I'm wrong.

425 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) That's correct, Mme. Chair. And there are cases in Ste. Sophie, Lachenaie,
and they are in this kind of situation.

430 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

430 (Translation) Very well, let's assume that a decree allows for this, because there has been
the whole assessment once again of the impacts, the whole procedure, public participation, and
so forth. I mean this cannot just be done by Cabinets. So, there was a notice of project for a
larger site, and then it closes down. Now, the thirty (30) year period, when does it start? Is it
435 when there is shutdown? And the thirty (30) year period now, is it automatically in force, or is that
a maximum amount of time? Explain this to us, please.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

440 (Translation) In terms of the post-shutdown fund, everything starts kicking in after
shutdown, of course, after operations are terminated, but there is something in the decree that
states that the proponent may be freed.

445 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Freed, okay.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

450 (Translation) So, would not be liable anymore and to carry out the tests and analyses and
so forth after five (5) years, I think.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

455 (Translation) Very well then, the follow-up.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

460 (Translation) Yes, Mme. Chair.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

465 (Translation) So, must the proponent then still - there's a section that applies to the post-shutdown fund. I mean even if he stops doing the analyses and taking samplings, does he still have to do follow-up?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

470 (Translation) Give me a moment, please, Madam. I need to talk with my colleague here.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do you have any information?

475 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Just an interpretation.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

480 (Translation) Mme. Chair --

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

485 (Translation) Are you ready to answer, or do you want your Ministry to send you a legal opinion?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

490 (Translation) No, I think Michel Bourret can answer the question.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

495 (Translation) Well, initially, something needs to be specified. Thirty (30) years, this is just for the post-shutdown management fund. The fund will be in activity over a thirty (30) year period at the very least.

500 Now, as to the post-shutdown follow-up, there is no time limit. This has to be done as long as the site may contaminate the environment. And in order to stop maintaining and doing follow-up on the site, one has to be sure that, over a five (5) year period, all the standards are being respected in terms of the leachates, in terms of making sure that the waters, the leachates

that are trapped, and the gases, that everything is in line with quality criteria before treatment. In other words, the whole site has become - well, is not a source of pollution anymore.

505 And the operator is not freed from applying the quality standards. It's only a matter of the maintenance and the follow-up that he doesn't have to do anymore, but he's still liable. But if after the five (5) year period, after he has been freed from doing the follow-up, all of a sudden, we see that the standards are not being respected anymore, they're going overboard, because there has been, say, an analysis done by the Ministry, then the proponent, the operator, the operator does
510 have to solve the problem and do - start doing treatment again, if need be. So, he would not be freed of all of his obligations, but just in terms of maintenance and follow-up.

And given the fact that the post-shutdown management fund, I mean if this occurs before the end of - before the fund itself runs out of money, because this fund is around to do follow-up
515 and maintenance of the site, then the fund itself is freed. And I mean there was a project that is our draft regulation, but it hasn't been accepted yet, but there has been talk about sending the money to the municipality in that case. And this is sort of what is expected, although it hasn't been passed yet.

520 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Well, that's clear.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

525 (Translation) Yes, it is clear. Nevertheless, we're talking about a situation where if there is pollution six (6) years after the fact, nobody will be there to see that it does occur, because there won't be any follow-up anymore after five (5) years.

530 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Well, there are two (2) things. There's the follow-up done by the proponent, which is compulsory, but also the Ministry of Environment will be doing a follow-up. So, they can go on site and check.

535 And my understanding, at any rate, is that, during five (5) years, there was no problem, nothing bad coming out, so to speak, and the proponent was freed from the obligation to do follow-up. The fund is still around. It does exist.

540 The Ministry then, three (3) years later, for instance, might see that there is a problem, or people from the vicinity are coming up with questions and concerns. So, the Ministry goes in, takes samples, sees that there is contamination, and asks the proponent to go on doing the follow-up.

545 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) Yes, I do understand that. Thank you, Mme. Chair, for explaining this. Nevertheless, I'm still quite concerned after reading the Auditor General's report in December, 2006, in Quebec as to the lack of follow-up done by the Ministry of the Environment in Quebec on
550 landfill sites in the province. It is clear that things are not done adequately, because they don't have enough inspectors. There aren't enough inspections.

And, therefore, as a resident of the region, I have good cause for concern. If there is pollution on that site, it may not be detected in due time.

555

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) I'll invite you to deal with this matter in your brief. As was said yesterday, there is a principle here, that of sustainable development and of polluter pays. So, we're talking
560 about an activity here that requires a certain follow-up on the part of society at large. So, how should this be managed? We would like to hear you on this issue in the second phase of the hearings.

565 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) Yes, we will be dealing with that, thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

570 (Translation) Mr. Ota Hora; Ms. Alexandra Pritchard.

MS. ALEXA PRITCHARD:

575 Good morning, my name is Alexa Pritchard. My family pioneered along the river a hundred and sixty-five (165) years ago. They preserved the land for future generations, and I intend to do the same for my grandchildren.

580 When my family first went up the Gatineau, there was only a footpath along the riverside. Hostels or keeps were built along this trail every twelve (12) miles, one day's travel apart. I own one of them. The trail expanded to a cart track and then to a highway. Consequently, the hundred and sixty (160), hundred eighty (180) year old homes, heritage homes, are now only a metre or two (2) from the highway, including the ones with the windows broken by the vibrations of passing trucks.

585 These heritage homes, our historical record, are the structures that are most vulnerable.

My question is concerning impact studies. Why was no effort made to take these valuable heritage homes into account?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

590

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; I'll give the floor to Patrick Gagnon.

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

595

(Translation) Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, good morning, we've already tabled during the first hearing, I believe, a document that deals with the issue of vibrations caused by traffic. In the context of the impact assessment study, we did study traffic. And, however, we must be reminded that LDC would not be the carrier. We did study the impact that might be related by the presence of carriers going to the site.

600

And as to the vibrations, there may be specific cases. So, we do have methods that would allow us to measure this, but I think it would be up to the Ministry of Transportation to look into these specific cases, because the homes are very close to the road, but in the document, at any rate, it is pointed out that, by and large, vibrations are not sufficient to cause this kind of problem, although, in specific instances, this may occur, but this would require a specific study on those buildings.

605

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

610

(Translation) Well, first of all, the Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment, and Parks, has that issue - has that question - is it part of the instructions? Although instructions are never exhaustive, but the Minister indicates basically the issues that have to be dealt with, but the proponent must deal with everything, even if it's not spelled out in the instructions. Anything that might change the quality of the environment has to be dealt with by him, but is this part of the instructions or the directive?

615

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

620

(Translation) Well, yes, indeed, Mme. Chair, we have a standard type of directive. It's pretty broad, but as to telling you whether or not, in terms of protecting these, I think the lady used the word "heritage" for these homes. I think it is part of the directive. I think it is. At any rate, in the impact assessment study it has to be dealt with.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

625

(Translation) Alright, now, the Ministry of Transportation, do you look into these

matters? I'm talking about the impact of the frequent passage of trucks near to homes that are heritage homes.

630 MR. JACQUES HENRY:

(Translation) Well, in fact, at the government department, all that we do is that - is upon request when there are complaints. We go on site. We analyze specific cases. And often times, it may be a problem with the pavement, and this creates vibration, and then, we will act. But as I mentioned, we act when we get complaints on the part of residents. We know that, on the 105, there is a certain number of trucks going by already, on the 301 as well. So, to the best of my knowledge, there may have been complaints, but I don't know of any.

640 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Madam, did you ever file a complaint with the Ministry of Transportation on this issue of the vibrations?

645 MS. ALEXA PRITCHARD:

No, I haven't, but I am concerned. I don't know if you are aware that these heritage homes, by and large, were constructed without nails. We're talking about one log sitting on top of the other and held together with a mortar, cement, horsehair. The vibrations will not only break the windows, but it will also totally destroy the buildings. I think that the Minister - if there is a Ministry of Cultural and Heritage in Quebec, they should be invited into this debate. Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) I think it would be important for you to table your file, as well as that of the people in your vicinity. I mean, in the hearing, we've heard it said that there are many instances comparable to this.

So, we could ask the Ministry of Transportation to work in cooperation with the Ministry of Cultural Affairs to look into this issue, because we're in a position, indeed, to see that there are very nice buildings, log upon log, in the region. And I think that it would be useful to do this. So, I will invite you on behalf of the commission to deal with this issue in your brief in the second phase.

660 MS. ALEXA PRITCHARD:

665 I appreciate that, thank you very much.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Ray Thomas.

670

MR. RAY THOMAS:

Good morning, Mme. Chairperson, Mr. Commissioner, my name is Ray Thomas. My question relates to the phenomena of NIMBY'ism. The impact study on page 21 claims that the promoter gave up his bid for a mega dump at Quillon in 2003 because of citizens being guilty of the NIMBY syndrome. That's not-in-my-backyard syndrome. And he would no doubt feel the same probably about the widespread opposition to the proposed Danford mega dump.

675

NIMBY'ism seems to have a negative connotation in many people's minds. However, recent articles I've seen on recent studies including an article in the Ottawa business news fairly recently states that NIMBY'ism is now a positive force of society. It involves the general population in the debate and will prevent bad projects from occurring, and it's a movement for change.

680

So, I would like to know who - in this particular case, I'd like to know who the promoter feels are more guilty of NIMBY'ism: small communities threatened with huge amounts of garbage from far away or large communities that send their garbage far away from their backyards to dump it in somebody else's.

685

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

690

(Translation) This issue of NIMBY'ism was debated at length at all of the public hearings. So, for quite a while now, this issue, not an issue, not a problem, but this factor has become a component or a trigger between the different protagonists: proponents and population.

However, Mme. Chair, what is important for us to understand in the present case is the criteria that were used in choosing this site, that were applied in our impact assessment study.

695

We have carried out many studies, and Teknika has been around for 1928. We're the second oldest consultant firm in Quebec after SNC Lavalin, and we will be celebrating our eightieth anniversary next year. And all the projects that we've carried out, in all of these cases, we've been confronted with NIMBY'ism.

700

Based on our experience - and I have some experience internationally. I've been working in this domain, in this field, for many years. And I can tell you, Mme. Chair, that the site that has been chosen is exceptional. Mr. Poissant said it is ideal. I can tell you that every time that we choose a site, there are thirty (30) or so selection criteria, thirty-two (32), if one wants to be very precise.

705

710 And it's the very first time in my whole career, and the first time in all the files that our firm has dealt with, that we see that practically all the criteria have been met. There's always, when we choose such a site, one (1) or two (2) or possibly many criteria that are not met.

715 In this case, all the criteria have been met: wildlife, fauna, flora, brooks, isolation, everything. Now, the problem is in terms of social acceptability, but in terms of physical, chemical realities and the environment and all the other criteria, it is a very good site.

720 Now, social acceptability will always be an issue. Very often, the physical and chemical or environmental criteria are not met, however, for many projects, and I won't be naming names. You know, there are always problems. So, then, it's either the water table or the landscape or the proximity of dwellings. There was always a problem, always a glitch, and then it was not the social criteria that created a problem. It was the environmental or physical issues. In this instance, there is no such problem.

725 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You're alluding to the criteria for selecting the site, but you're not talking about transportation in your criteria. And one of the major problems that Mr. Poissant has alluded to specifically has to do with transportation.

730 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

735 (Translation) Well, you're right, Mr. Commissioner. And I believe that if we had been allowed to do a comparative study of the present situation on the 148 as opposed to 105, we would have obtained interesting results.

740 Let's take the example of what the person just said, the previous person. Say we compared all of the heritage homes in Montebello, Papineauville, all these municipalities along the 148, and, for sixteen (16) years now, they've been having these vibrations from all of the garbage trucks leaving Gatineau and going to Lachute. And so - and let's compare that with the vibrations on the 105 and the 301.

And the same could be done for road accidents, traffic accidents, or the twenty-two thousand (22,000) people who see the trucks, garbage trucks, going by their home every day.

745 So, then, we could compare, and things would be interesting and much better in terms of understanding what transport is all about.

Because transport, I mean, both in the impact assessment studies that were done for Ste. Thérèse-de-Blainville, Stablex, PCB's, hazardous waste, for all of the projects, the part

750 that has to do with transport was mostly felt outside of the zone dealt with by the impact study. So, when we do this kind of study, the zone of influence that is accepted by the environmental assessment branch is one (1) to two (2) or three (3) kilometres around the site.

755 Now, the issue of transport for the Stablex project in Ste. Thérèse, PCB's in St. Basile-le-Grand, etc., and I know, because I did those studies, so, transportation, I'm sorry, the Ministry of Transportation is under an obligation, and Mr. Henry said so, to serve the clients. So, these may be logging trucks, industry, garbage trucks from the townships. They are under that obligation.

760 MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

(Translation) I would like to specify something or to answer to a certain extent. They can't make me say anything I haven't said. What I said yesterday is that it's ideal in terms of toxicology, because there's practically nobody who will be exposed, nobody close enough. So, in terms of 765 toxicology, it's not a problem, really, not in terms of transportation or social acceptability. That's not what I said.

Let's not forget that, in 2009 or 2010, Highway 50 will have been built. And so, the trucks won't be using the 148 anymore. So, I'd just like to provide this information to the commission.

770

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, may I also provide additional information? In terms of land use planning - and I'm talking specifically about the site here - in my opinion, this is the site that will 775 entail less impact in terms of co-inhabiting with different uses. We could set it up in a different location, but there would be more different types of uses, dwellings, businesses, and so forth. And then, there would, of course, be more opposition in those - on the part of the people there.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

780

(Translation) Well, if we talk about social acceptability, equity is an issue. We're talking here about biophysics and all of those impacts, but the perception of equity is also an important factor. And I believe that that parameter or that value is often presented as being important for the population. It is important for people to feel that there is equity of sorts. This is - I mean it's not an 785 illness to go and think that we would like things to be equitable. I mean this is part of our values in this society.

And in this regard, it's true that it's a bit unpleasant for people to be told that, well, you will have - you are suffering from NIMBY'ism, say. So, there was inadequate use of this kind of

790 approach, and this increases the whole problem, telling people you're sick; you have a problem with your perception of reality.

So, there's the issue of equity that we must take into account as well. And in this regard, well, society must be working at making sure that there is a certain degree of general appreciation,
795 I mean, that people have the feeling that they were dealt with fairly, and that's not easy. Does anybody want to say anything more?

MR. LOUIS-MARIE POISSANT:

800 (Translation) Yes, Madam, I'd like to add a few comments, if I may. We define social health as the fact that a community has control of its environment in the widest possible sense. When this control does not exist, then there's lots of problems, alienation, psychosocial problems, and so on. So, that is a very important criterion.

805 However, the problem is that it's very difficult to measure, but, in this case, one can see that the problem comes from the fact that the citizens of the Outaouais are consumers and producers of waste. And the waste producers we are are also citizens who vote, and who tend obviously to push back as much as possible this kind of system.

810 So, of course, it would have been more ideal if the site had been closer to the production centres, because as I said, citizens are waste producers and citizens both. So, I understand quite clearly the difficulty they have or we have in getting this social acceptability.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

815 (Translation) I find your statement very interesting relating to the equity principle. Actually, it's one of the most important principles on sustainable environment legislation, I think, social equity and so on, so, that principle that will be in the Human Rights legislation later.

820 If I look at equity, I'm an engineer. So, I'm looking at biophysical characteristics. But if you look at what has been happening since 1991, in the Outaouais region, there is an impact of the transportation of waste. What is that impact?

825 If I measure it on the basis of equity, and it's very difficult to do, Mr. Poissant mentioned it, but going from Gatineau to Lachute is one hundred forty (140) kilometres roughly, one thirty-five (135), one fifty (150). Let's say one forty (140). Going from Gatineau to Danford Lake is eighty (80) kilometres. So, there's a difference of sixty (60) kilometres. Return, that's one hundred twenty (120) kilometres.

830 So, just for a quick calculation, let's say one hundred (100) kilometres difference,

multiplied by the number of trucks mentioned by Mr. Nadeau, multiplied by two hundred fifty (250) days per year, multiplied by - well, let's not multiply it by sixteen (16) years, but we're talking about sixty thousand (60,000) kilometres or more of reduced impact. So, each year, there's sixty thousand (60,000) kilometres less as impact is concerned.

835

There's no second-class citizens. The twenty thousand (20,000) citizens residing between Gatineau and Lachute are citizens like all the others, like those between Gatineau and Danford Lake.

840

And yesterday I even expressed the fear, personal fear, about negotiating projects between Gatineau and Trois Rivières. They're talking about transporting waste from Gatineau to Trois Rivières. And those negotiations are far advanced. So, the matter of transportation, if the project is accepted, there will be sixty thousand (60,000) kilometres less of impact per year.

845

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, Pierre Duchesne, Pontiac municipality, a small clarification relating to the cohabiting of land uses, in the waste - in the land use plan of Pontiac relating to how the territory can be used, there are obviously difficult choices to be made, when time comes to make decisions about where various types of facilities required by the community will be set up. And always we look if there are any incompatible users. That is the expression we use. If there are incompatible users, then the facilities will not be built there, and we'll try to find a better location, a more adequate location.

850

855

And, obviously, there are choices, difficult choices, to be made. Whatever choice is made, some people will be displeased. And about the location of the site, we believe that as far as land use is concerned, it is the location that has fewer impacts on the environment and relating to the cohabitation of land uses.

860

So, I repeat there are difficult choices to be made, and that is the situation facing each municipality. When they prepare a land use plan, they have this kind of decisions to make.

MR. RAY THOMAS:

865

A comment that this answer strayed a little bit far from the question; I will challenge the statement by LDC that, in fact, this is the best site and has no risks. I'll challenge that in my presentation in the second phase.

870

I would also challenge the - I would challenge this number of sixty thousand (60,000). The distance we're talking about is a hundred (100) kilometres. And I agree that that is a long - that's a long distance, in my mind, and there's a lot of kilometres involved on bad highways.

875 I would also like to point out that there are other technologies which could be put very close to the site where the majority of the garbage is generated, and treated with less environmental risks than the landfill sites. And I think that should be considered in any decision.

880 And I commend you on bringing up the issue of perception of equity, because the perception of equity here is that all the risk is being put on the people along Highway 105 and 301 and the people in the small village, which is a small number of people. The majority of the population is not located in Danford village. It's located elsewhere with the highest concentration in Gatineau. And so, the people in Danford will not have the equity, in my mind.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

885 (Translation) Thank you; we will hear you again then during the second phase; Mr. Renato Livinal.

MR. RENATO LIVINAL:

890 Good morning, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, thank you very much for giving me the last opportunity after four (4) days to be able to place one little question. I will try to take up as little time as possible, because my president and other people would like to ask additional questions.

895 With your permission, Mme. Le President, (translation) with your authorization, I would like to submit a plan de la Mont O'Brien Association, (end of translation) that it will show the tracks and the trails that the Mont O'Brien Association, and with my assistance as well, have been working on for the last - since the year 2000, okay.

900 As an addendum, and it's not my question, but something that it has to do with security and danger, and it has to deal specifically with the Minister of Transport. When we applied for - when the municipality applied for a permission to enter to the 301, which has not been brought out so far in terms of transport, the Minister of Transport had requested the municipality and myself to clear some sections where the current entrance to the park exist.

905 The location is a very dangerous location. It's a fact. It's a physical fact. We have over five hundred and twenty (520) members as of last year count, not this year, because this year it's going to increase, which will have access to the Mont O'Brien Association lake through my property and through this entrance.

910 The Ministry of Transport, prior to giving us a permit to actually have this entrance, requested me to clear a section of the curve, in other words, to cut the trees down, so that the visibility could have been at a better visibility. We proceeded to do that, and - but we still have a

very, very large and dangerous problems there, in that we have these people coming in and out.

915 We have the tractor trailers going through on that stretch of the highway, and I'd like them to check this out, which are coming through at a hundred (100), a hundred and twenty (120) kilometres an hour, eighteen (18) wheelers. So, those are people - those are tractor trailers full of logs, and they have no chance really of braking at all, if some of the people will come out of my property will come in and out directly into the 301, point number 1.

920 Point number 2, it has not brought to your attention that - I presented my plan yesterday of Lac Miljour Estate, of Lac Miljour Estate, in that there are several - as you've seen on the plan that I submitted, you will have several houses right along the 301, on both sides of the property running along the 301. Now, that, as a future consideration, is to the additional traffic and population of my particular area, notwithstanding.

925 My question, so, that's the point of the transportation. My question has to deal with the promoter and on a social economical aspect of things. I would like them to point out what the location or their findings, where they're talking about the property values not being decreased through the implementation of this mega dump. So, that is my question, if they show me where this finding was done. What is the location of this finding?

930 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

935 (Translation) Mme. Chair, we have tabled two (2) studies, and we have other studies that confirm that there is very little impact on the value of property. Those documents have been provided to the commission. A study has been done also in a recent case that we did not mention. It's the Ste. Sophie landfill site. The documents are at the BAPE, at the Bureau, and they are available.

940 And as an aside, for the participants, I add that you are involved in that case, as the Chair of the commission. So, I think that study relating to Ste. Sophie has demonstrated that the impact on the value of property is negligible. In the U.S., in Sherbrooke, in Ste. Sophie, in Lachenaie, in the other study done by the real estate agency, there is very little impact.

945 However, being the neighbour of a trench dump where the radius of impact on the ground water is within one kilometre, obviously, then the trench dump can have an impact on the value of the property that is close to a trench dump, whose contamination risk cannot be assessed and for which a geologist would not sign an approval.

950 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, the documents will be available. If some are not available yet, they will be. You will see at the end of the room the documents that have been tabled. You will be able to

955 look at them. If you have any questions relating to those documents, you can send the questions to the commission by Tuesday, end of the day.

MR. RENATO LIVINAL:

960 Thank you, Mme. President; my question has been ignored. It has not been answered. I specifically asked the location, the actual specific location. You cannot compare an analysis of Aylmer beside the Cooke's dump vis-à-vis our location, being a tourist-oriented area where people have the choice to invest two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000.00) for a four (4) season chalet.

965 And I wonder how many in this present, in this setting, would actually invest two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000.00) beside being a dump. The people who will have the choice to do that, they will not go, and I can prove this in my presentation.

970 And the next point, of course, is that Aylmer people do not have a choice. Cooke's people do not have a choice. So, in that particular case, that is where the property could not have devalued. I'm not sure about that.

975 I conclude by thanking Mme. Le President, Commissioner, for the opportunity of giving me four (4) of these questions in the first four (4) years. I thank you and your committee and your team of work. Thank you so much.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

980 (Translation) Mr. John Edwards.

MR. JOHN EDWARDS:

985 Mme. Chair, Commissioner Labrie, since we're coming to the end of this first phase, may I, on behalf of many of us here, express our appreciation for the courtesy, the professionalism, and perhaps, above all, the seemingly tirelessness of your work. And we look forward to the second phase, when this particular phase ends.

990 On page 31 of the promoter's impact study are listed seven (7) criteria for choosing a site for a mega dump to serve the Outaouais. One of these has already been spoken about this morning, and that is that the dump should be within a hundred (100) kilometres of Gatineau. It's an interesting distance. If it was a little bit greater, it could include Lachute, which is the main alternative landfill site. If it was a little bit shorter, it would exclude the Danford site itself.

995 My question is for the promoter. Were these the considerations behind the choice of a

hundred (100) kilometres, or was there a more substantive analytical reason for choosing one hundred (100) as opposed to fifty (50) or thirty (30) or fifteen (15)?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1000

(Translation) Mr. Poulin will answer.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1005

(Translation) I will be - one has to be careful when we talk about figures. I made a mistake in my calculation, sir, a bit earlier. I didn't have my calculator, and, you know, an engineer without a calculator cannot count.

1010

If we take sixty (60) - twenty (20) trucks leaving Gatineau going to Lachute, and one hundred (100) kilometres less, and two hundred fifty (250) days, that gives four hundred thousand (400,000) kilometres per year, not two hundred, say, fifty thousand (250,000). So, I have to correct. So, it's not sixty thousand (60,000) kilometres per year. It's four hundred thousand (400,000) kilometres per year.

1015

Now, let's come back to the one hundred (100) kilometre limit. Why one hundred (100) instead of seventy-five (75) or one hundred twenty-five (125)? That is another - based on another economic calculation that has been done in many other cases to establish what is called the dead zone, the dead point, or the break-even point.

1020

That break-even point, it remains from which point a transfer station - in our case, what is very interesting is that Gatineau has an infrastructure for a transfer centre, and Wakefield also has one, and it's not the reverse. It's not the regional municipalities of the Outaouais that have transfer centres to go to Gatineau. It's the contrary. Major cities have transfer centres to transport their waste somewhere else. So, we had to take into account those two (2) transfer sites. Those

1025

transfer centres go to one hundred forty (140) kilometres distance or more.

So, for economic reasons, transfer centres usually are built at about seventy-five (75) kilometres. Under that, there are some municipalities that will not transfer their waste in small trucks, from a small truck or seven (7) ton truck to a trailer of fifty (50) tons. So, usually, the limit is seventy (70), seventy-five (75) kilometres.

1030

So, this is why we thought that there might be municipalities that would - that might keep using a small seven (7) ton truck, the trucks used in the streets, and not transfer their waste. So, this is why we selected one hundred (100) kilometres. Now, it is quite certain that if it's one hundred forty (140) kilometres, then you need a transfer centre.

1035

THE COMMISSIONER:

1040 (Translation) Is that a criterion that is generally accepted for other similar studies, or is it your criterion in this case?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1045 (Translation) Well, for other regional municipalities, Memphremagog, Haute St. François, we have carried out economic studies, and the criterion of the capacity to pay of the taxpayers is a very well-known criterion in the studies, in the literature, and in our economic studies, not for this case only. It is really a generally well-known criterion, the transportation criterion or the cost of transportation.

1050 THE COMMISSIONER:

1055 (Translation) So, it is a criterion that is applied in Quebec in general. From what I understand, it is generally accepted. But if it was a criterion that was applied a few years ago based on the cost of gas, should it not be changed today with the present price of gas?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1060 (Translation) Well, that's an excellent point. At one dollar fourteen (\$1.14) a litre compared to eighty cents (\$0.80) when the calculations were made, because I remember the calculations for Memphremagog not too long ago. And there will be actually public hearings next week, and we were basing our calculations on eighty cents (\$0.80) a litre. And at that time, we were at seventy-five (75) kilometres. At one hundred thirteen cents (\$1.13) a litre, it will increase the distance.

1065 And so, that criterion will become more and more important, the criterion of the cost of transportation. The share of the transportation in the whole bill of waste management will become more and more important. And this is why we try to get closer to the centres where waste is produced.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1070 (Translation) You said that transportation is an important factor, but also for the environment it's a major factor.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1075 (Translation) Well, the problem, and Mr. Nadeau referred to it yesterday, is that the closer you are to the production centres, in the case of Outaouais, you're getting closer to the

farmlands of the lower St. Lawrence. And so, then, there are other issues like geographical location.

1080

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Well, for these technical sites, but if you use another technology, then you don't have the same criteria.

1085

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Well, yes, if you go to Europe, in Japan, in Asia, you see that burning technology, thermal technologies are close to the production centres, because it's not the same technology.

1090

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

(Translation) I would like to add a piece of information relating to the justification of transfer centres. I agree with the conclusion of Mr. Poulin relating to the distances and to the break-even point that determines if a transfer centre is preferable. In fact, we're doing the same study now. And based on where the waste is going, do we need to build transfer centres?

1095

And there are other factors also that influence that kind of decision such as not only distance, but a municipality of four hundred (400) people does not produce a full truck. So, if the truck or municipality "x" goes directly to the site and comes back, it is not available to provide other services in the regional municipality. So, the criterion of distance is important, but there are other factors to be taken into account.

1100

THE COMMISSIONER:

1105

(Translation) Yes, thank you.

MR. JOHN EDWARDS:

1110

May I just add that there are many, many cities across this country, large cities about the same size as Gatineau, that handle their own waste within ten (10) kilometres?

Could I ask one further question? Thank you; the location of the proposed Danford dump is on the - perhaps - yes, the map is here. I'm not sure it shows the boundaries. Yes, it does. The location of the Danford dump, as you can see, is on the extreme eastern edge of the quite large Pontiac MRC geographic area. The key river, the Picanoc, very shortly after it passes the proposed dump site, disappears into a neighbouring MRC.

1115

1120

Almost all the heavy traffic coming up to the dump site, as we have heard, would be

coming from other MRC's and the City of Gatineau, if the City of Gatineau cooperated. Only a tiny proportion of the garbage will come from the MRC Pontiac, because the population of the MRC Pontiac is tiny. It's a very, very small population base.

1125 Yet, the municipal council of Allevyn-and-Cawood gave quick support to the proposal, and then the MRC Pontiac followed this with its support without in-depth consultations on the ramifications nor - and without negotiation of any agreements with any of the other players that are necessarily involved, if the project is to be viable.

1130 So much of the conflict with the citizens has come about through this strange process, this go-it-alone attitude that has taken place. So much of this expenditure of this BAPE hearings with armies of public servants being tied up for days has come about, because there seems to be a strange belief on the part of the Pontiac MRC that somehow everything would fall into place, that they could disregard almost any obstacle, but, sooner or later, everything would come on line.
1135 The Mayor of Gatineau would throw his support. All the other municipalities would throw their support.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1140 (Translation) Please, could I ask you --

MR. JOHN EDWARDS:

1145 Yes, I'm coming to it.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) To be brief?

1150 MR. JOHN EDWARDS:

I will. I'm just coming to my question right now.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1155 (Translation) Okay.

MR. JOHN EDWARDS:

1160 That somehow that they would all be coopted into following the Pontiac's wise leadership. Doesn't the MRC Pontiac realize how odd this all is, that, in retrospect, wasn't it acting in rather a bizarre and unilateral manner? That is my question.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1165

(Translation) Okay, relating to the waste management plan, those plans change every five (5) years. They have to be reviewed every five (5) years. How did you - you had some consultations to prepare your management plan. And that management plan determines where the disposal sites could be set up, and where the waste would come from.

1170

So, can citizens be involved to tell their regional municipality this is my opinion about your plan; this is what I think? How did you organize your consultations, and how will you organize your consultations for the next step, since the plan changes and evolves?

1175

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1180

(Translation) For developing the plan, we have just followed the provisions of the legislation on quality of the environment relating to such plans. In our process, we had public consultations. We held two (2) hearings, two (2) public consultation meetings, on June 28th and 29th, 2003. We had to respect the time limits established in the legislation to get as many people as possible to be involved. Those persons came to the consultation, to the meetings.

1185

We raised the issue of the management of waste from A to Z, including the issue of disposing of the waste. And, yes, there were concerns expressed. There were discussions about the closing of trench dumps and the possibility that there would be or not the setting up of a new landfill site respecting the provisions of the legislation.

1190

Now, I'm talking about public consultations. People are consulted. We collected their opinions. We took into account their concerns. And after that, obviously, during the following years up until today, the situation has evolved. This issue has evolved.

1195

Now, at the regional level also, there was a reflection in order to try and find a regional solution to the disposal of waste. And we came to the conclusion that, and I've already mentioned it, it was at least in the interest of the Pontiac municipality to look at the feasibility of setting up a TLS without thinking that it would be the best solution, the best alternative, but at least it would be taken into account, and it would fit in with our interest, because the more you move west in the region, the fewer alternatives you have.

1200

If you look at Papineau, they are relatively closer to Lachute. Gatineau, at the present time, goes to Lachute. And so, for a matter of the criteria of geography, also because we wanted to be able to treat final waste, we had to take account of this possible solution and before the project was submitted.

And I'm talking here of about 2004. Mr. Rouleau can correct me if necessary, but our

1205 thinking about a site, a landfill site, had started before 2004. Maybe it just happened that way that a promoter or proponent came up and said I might have a solution for you, and we listened. And this is the reason why, today, we have this project within our management plan or land use planning.

1210 But at any point in time or at all times, people were either directly or indirectly consulted, and these public consultations, as we developed our waste management plan, occurred. And there were people who came to tell us about their concerns, be it regarding the final waste, the treatment, or the overall issue of managing waste.

1215 People came to regular meetings of the Council of Mayors. They told us what their concerns were. They provided very relevant comments, very interesting comments, but once again, and I'm coming back to the analogy that I used when I spoke of co-inhabitation of different types of use, we have to come to a point where you make a choice. So, we came to the conclusion that, well, we need to go ahead and use this possible solution, given our specific
1220 situation in the Outaouais region.

So, yes, indeed, we did take into account the population's opinions, and this will not stop. We're willing to go on working with the population to find something that may be even better for everybody.

1225

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

(Translation) I would like to add following up on your question that this policy for 1998 to 2008 in managing waste is based on a certain number of foundations including participation on the
1230 part of the citizens. So, there is public consultation of the population throughout the whole process, as we produce these waste management plans.

On our territory, we held four (4) consultation meetings. One has to know that this is of a certain interest, but if it's - there's no major crisis, people don't mobilize as much. The same would apply for the meetings of the RCM council. I'm not there all that often, but, in my own
1235 opinion, if there is no major crisis, few people go there regularly.

And so, in our management plan, we decided to set up a citizens' committee which is similar, in a way, to the watchdog committee that has to be created for landfill sites. So, there's a
1240 link between the elected representatives and the population at large to follow up on these plans. So, this is our choice. We haven't fully implemented all of this. So, I can't tell you about the overall results, but I would encourage citizens.

And, of course, we're talking about participation on the part of the citizens, as we try and reach these goals. And it's up to citizens to go to these consultations and to make sure that there
1245 are mechanisms that allow for this kind of participation.

MR. JOHN EDWARDS:

1250 My central question has been answered. I was asking essentially in trying to describe at some length, and I appreciate - I went on somewhat longer than you'd have liked.

1255 Pontiac was addressing an issue that involved or acquired the involvement of all kinds of other parts of the Outaouais. What Pierre Duchesne has talked about is what they did within the Pontiac, but why wasn't there substantive in-depth discussions with Kazabazua, with Low, with La Pêche, with the City of Gatineau, to try and get an agreement on how this thing was going to work or would not work? You will hear in the second part mayors who will come before you, who will say they do not agree with this proposal.

1260 So, I'm lost. I still think Pontiac is on its own, basically stumbling along, and we are, as a result, carrying the fruit of that. It's a bitter fruit.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1265 (Translation) Thank you.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1270 (Translation) Mme. Chair --

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1275 (Translation) Before we take a break, I'd like to see how many people will be asking to take the floor. I do have a long list. I'll ask you, please, to tell us if you want to come and ask a question. Ms. Johanne Rougier or her spokesperson, no; Mr. Ed Masotti, yes; Ms. Mary Masotti; Ms. Sue Rogan; Ms. Annie Peck or her spokesperson; Mr. George McCormick; Mr. Patrick Fowler; Mr. Zenon Chmielowski, no; Mr. Steve Fowler, no; Ms. Linda Cronk, yes, we have her name already, do we not? Ms. Dorothy MacKay; Mr. André Carrière; Mr. Paul Dingledine, anyway, I'm trying. I need to take a class; Ms. Laura Raymond; Mr. Jacques Raymond; Mr. or Ms. Michèle Borchers; Mr. André Carrière we've named already; Mr. Renato Livinal; Mr. Ray Thomas; Mr. John Edwards; Mr. George McCormick, we've named the gentleman. Right then, so we have fourteen (14) people to go.

1285 MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, if you will allow me, after the break, I would like to provide further information to Mr. Thomas. You are Mr. Thomas, are you not? The person who did the last intervention, please, oh, yes, sorry, I apologize.

1290 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) There's somebody on the list whose name I haven't read out? Please use the microphone.

1295 MR. OTA HORA:

1300 It was trying to get by on the Highway 105. So, it's a long trip. I want your guarantee that I will be fully heard, because I am the only the representative from Kazabazua, and we are the most affected community in addition to Danford Lake. A number of other people have had a lot of time to speak. I've been - for some reason, I was not here this morning, but yesterday I was here and the day before, and I have not been heard. And I want to ensure that I will be fully heard, that the proceedings will not close before I have a chance to speak.

1305 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) I would ask the people who have already asked questions to allow this gentleman to be the first one after the break.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

1310

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1315 (Translation) So, we have fifteen (15) names. We can work until twelve thirty (12:30). So, I would ask you to avoid preambles. Just ask your question, be brief. You will be able to provide more information and develop your points at the second phase. I have twenty-five (25) minutes for statements by the commission at the end; so, now, Mr. Ota Hora.

MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1320 (Translation) Mme. Chair, would you allow me to provide some additional information? I'll be very, very brief. It's just to answer Mr. Edwards. The Pontiac municipal - regional municipality has had meetings. We've had discussions with Gatineau in order to try and find solutions to this problem. It has not necessarily produced results. That's all. Thank you.

1325 MR. OTA HORA:

1330 (Translation) Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, my name is Ota Hora. I come from Czechoslovakia. We left with our family from the Communist regime in 1948, got here in 1949. I learned French, because I lived with a French family in Port Alfred when I was ten (10). I live in Kazabazua. I'm retired. I was a major in the Canadian military. I could have chosen to live anywhere. I chose to live in Kazabazua.

1335 People of Kazabazua have asked me to be involved in politics in 2005. My friend is Joe Squitti, the Mayor of Danford Lake. And I talked to him before being involved into politics to discuss about the site with him, and he told me that it was a matter for Danford Lake only. It was their choice, their decision, and other people do not have the power to take part in the discussions, and they would be involved only after the environmental impact studies are done.

1340 Mr. Carrière asked me if our municipal council - if we were approached by the promoter to have meetings in Kazabazua. (End of translation) I have talked with Adrian Noel, the Mayor. He never received that sort of request. He told me yesterday that he would have been more than open to having a meeting and discussion of this sort. Personally, I have never received a request from Mr. Rouleau for a meeting. I have never discussed the dump with Mr. Rouleau. So, I just want to clarify that was a previous outstanding that requires correction.

1345 The problem that we're facing, and I was on the municipal council when it happened, is the higher levels of government have these timetables, and sometimes they don't plan ahead. I think it's the case from the Department of Environment sending our municipality and others a letter in January, indicating that we would no longer be able to burn and with no notification of - they could have done in the fall, telling us that this was coming, so we could have prepared additional trenches. In our small municipality, we ran out of - within two (2) months, we ran out of room, and we had to transship to Lachute at a great deal of additional cost.

1355 Our municipality is on record that we are totally opposed to an open-air landfill, the present technology, and totally opposed to transportation on the unsuitable Highway 105.

1360 It has become evident during - especially yesterday that there are a number of MRC's and the Ville de Gatineau that still have not come up with plans for how they want their waste treated. I would like to - the Chair to undertake to - in your report, as to highlight this quandary of what - the confusion that's happening, where one MRC has decided to go ahead, and the others still do not know. I think this has to be a solution for the whole Outaouais, not just for one MRC.

1365 I feel the promoter, whether intentionally and I'm sure it was inadvertently, I think, has shown a lack of respect for the local population. This particularly came out in terms of the discussion over Mr. Pelletier's small cabin.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1370 (Translation) Please, can you ask your question? Because you can deal with that at the second phase.

MR. OTA HORA:

Yes, the difficulty, it was stated yesterday that - and it was sort of with pride, that this

1375 was the most economical solution, this solution. We are not interested in the most economical solution. We are interested in the best solution. And Mr. Charest is on record of stating that Quebec is the most environmentally advanced province. We want to ensure that Quebec honours that, and that we don't cheap out the Outaouais.

1380 Our member of parliament, Lawrence Cannon, has a thirteen point five (13.5) billion dollar budget. Will the Chair undertake to advise Lawrence Cannon of the need for financial assistance for the upgrading of Highway 105 and the upgrading of the landfill site, so that again it is not done on the cheap, that it is done properly?

1385 This morning, driving down 105 again, it is absolutely incredible the difference. At Cantley, we crossed over to the other highway, and there's such a different feeling. Highway 105 is overloaded even this morning when we were coming down.

1390 A question for the promoter: Have you signed a contract with the MRC of the Pontiac or with the village of Danford Lake?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1395 (Translation) If you'll allow me, what type of contract are you referring to?

MR. OTA HORA:

About the dump.

1400 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do you have a written agreement relating to anything relating to the fill?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1405 (Translation) Well, there's - no, there's no agreement signed with anybody. There's no site yet.

MR. OTA HORA:

1410 Do you have a written agreement? It was stated on the record that you were paying the MRC two dollars (\$2.00) a ton in the village of - Danford village, two dollars (\$2.00) a ton. Is there a written contract of this? And are there any other offers that were made to the village of Danford or to the MRC or any officials?

1415

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) There's a memorandum of agreement. Yes, that one with the municipality has been signed. With the RCM, it is being negotiated at this time.

1420

MR. OTA HORA:

A question for Municipal Affairs, our municipal council - is there anyone from - a municipal council, I believe that anything, an expenditure of council, over twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000.00) has to be by tender. Is this correct?

1425

MR. BERNARD CHARTRAND:

(Translation) I am Bernard Chartrand. I'm at the Ministry. Yes, there is a rule relating to tenders, public tenders, for twenty-five thousand (\$25,000.00) or more.

1430

MR. OTA HORA:

So, my question is: If that is the regulation, how in the world could we get to a situation where we have a sole source supplier with no contract? We're here to approve a project that doesn't have any contractual basis. And who is going to set those parameters of what the agreement will be? And this is - I've never heard of a wide-open thing in any business dealing that I have ever been involved in. As a Deputy Mayor, if I ever did that, I would end up in I don't know where. So, what are we going to do?

1435

1440

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) That will be your last question, because I have fourteen (14) persons yet. You can send your questions in writing, and you will have until Friday, because I had announced Friday. So, we'll keep the date limit of Friday. So, you can relax a little bit during the weekend. So, we'll ask - we'll have your last question.

1445

MR. OTA HORA:

(Translation) I have not yet had an answer.

1450

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Yes, you'll have that answer now. Municipal Affairs, can you answer?

1455

MR. BERNARD CHARTRAND:

(Translation) About public tenders, generally speaking, we talk about tenders. Well, the

1460 council can have a sole source up of to twenty-five thousand (\$25,000.00). Now, from twenty-five
thousand (\$25,000.00) to one hundred thousand (\$100,000.00) relating to professional and
technical services, I can table the procedure. It's a different thing. It's based on the conformity of
the public tender. And according to the project, that's something else. I know that the RCM's
have contracts at this time, and that they have time limits, but the renewal is something else.
That does not come under Municipal Affairs.

1465 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) More information?

1470 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) I'm repeating, Mme. Chair, but LDC is not a transporter, nor is it a collector
of waste. So, the municipalities of Danford Lake, Kazabazua, or whatever, has to call for
tenders. And if the project is built, LDC will give a price to the transporter, who will want to carry
1475 the waste to this site or to another site.

So, for all the municipalities, there will be a call for tenders if it's for more than twenty-five
thousand dollars (\$25,000.00), but the LDC will not answer. It will be the transporters, who will
call, who will ask for prices for transporting and disposing. And then, we'll choose the better offer.

1480 MR. OTA HORA:

Our concern on the sole source is that you're in a position of dictating how much money
you will make without competition, and I've never heard of that situation ever before. My final
question is for the Department of Environment. What guarantees --

1485 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) You will submit it in writing, and we'll communicate it to the Ministry,
because we have fourteen (14) other names. Well, when your name is called; Mrs. Mary Lee de
1490 Lombard; Mr. Renato Livinal.

MR. ED MASOTTI:

Thank you, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner; my name is Ed Masotti, and I think I was
1495 supposed to be next on the list. I asked LDC to put up two (2) graphs, so that we could speed this
process up, and, hopefully, they've got them ready, but I will proceed. I think I - I have three (3)
questions, and it could be - the answer could be yes, no, a qualified yes, a qualified no, and I'll
follow up in writing later.

1500 Okay, the questions are to the MRC's and the City of Gatineau, and the first question is as follows. The table 2.4 that's in the document shows all of the garbage that you will have after you meet the 2008 targets. I would like to know if any of the garbage currently going to Cantley or Perkins is included in those figures. A yes, a no, or a qualified yes or no is acceptable.

1505 MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

 (Translation) It's table 1.4, not 2.4. Which document are you referring to?

1510 MR. ED MASOTTI:

 I'm sorry, I am talking to the LDC's evaluation, assessment.

 MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

1515 (Translation) Well, it's difficult to say yes or no. The assessments are rather based, I believe, as Mr. Laliberté said yesterday, on the Chamard Roche study. So, there could be a margin there, but the figure as such is difficult, and the people who have the right data are the RCM's of Vallée-des-Collines, Papineau, and Gatineau. And operating trench dumps, the data sometimes is rather doubtful.

1520 MR. ANDRE POULIN:

 (Translation) Briefly, yes, the answer is yes. You can see here that the CRD sector, construction, renovation, demolition, when the Cantley site closes and when the Val-des-Monts site for dry waste is closed, that is the scenario. When those two (2) sites are closed, they will be there in Cantley, and Gatineau, Des Collines.

 So, in the RCM of Des Collines, after sixty percent (60%) of diversion, there will be five thousand three hundred and six (5,306) tons. And Val-des-Monts, it's in Des Collines RCM. It's included, but I'm talking after meeting the objectives of recycling and when the two (2) sites are closed.

1530 MR. ED MASOTTI:

1535 Okay, I'll go on to my second question. Our feeling is that, on page 274, where they say here's all the garbage, and they base the truck assessment on this amount of garbage, we feel that, in reality, that's way overstated, and that the garbage going to Cantley and Perkins is actually hidden in that figure. I would like to ask the four (4) MRC's or three (3) MRC's and the City of Gatineau: Do they agree with these figures of what garbage will be coming from them or from the...

1540

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1545 (Translation) I believe it might be useful to ask that in writing to give them the time to prepare the answer.

MR. ED MASOTTI:

1550 Just one last quick question then to the City of Gatineau and to the MRC Collines: Would they accept the garbage that's currently going to Cantley and Perkins at their CRT centres? That could be a yes or no. When their two (2) dumps close, the garbage has to go somewhere.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1555 (Translation) Did you understand the question? Can you repeat the question?

MR. ED MASOTTI:

1560 Okay, yes, I will. When the Cantley and Perkins dump closes in 2009, the garbage has to go somewhere. Either - there are three (3) options. They can go to Danford Lake. They can go to Lachute, or they can go to the transfer stations that are maintained by the City of Gatineau, I believe, and by the MRC Collines.

1565 My question is: Will the MRC Collines and the City of Gatineau accept that garbage, if the developer wanted to send it there, you know, the private contractors wanted to send that garbage there?

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

1570 (Translation) I'm not sure I understand the question. You'll tell me if my answer is correct. At the present time, we're talking - you are talking about Kazabazua that had to close its trench dump. Kazabazua is sending its waste at the transfer centre of Val-des-Monts and not to the one you mentioned. There is a transfer to Val-des-Monts. Is that your question?

1575 MR. ED MASOTTI:

No.

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

1580 (Translation) So, can you repeat, please? I didn't understand.

MR. ED MASOTTI:

1585 Okay, I'll try it one more time. And if not, I'll be taking up too much time, and I will leave, and I'll put it in writing.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1590 (Translation) It would be preferable, actually, as soon as you can. As soon as we receive your question in writing, we'll deal with it, so that you can get the answers as soon as possible. You can send them until Friday.

MR. ED MASOTTI:

1595 Okay, thank you very much.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1600 (Translation) Mr. John Edwards; Mr. Ed Masotti, it's alright, okay, sorry; Mrs. Mary Masotti.

MS. MARY MASOTTI:

1605 Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, I'm Mary Masotti from Neil Lake. Under the recreation section of the impact studies by LDC, they say:

"The Pontiac River is suitable for canoeing. The starting point generally is around six (6) kilometres downstream from the proposed dump site".

1610 Given the impacts of this project on the Picanoc vis-à-vis visual, vectors, noise, and odour this project would have on the recreational uses of the river, I would assume that they have done due diligence and examined the uses of the Picanoc by recreational people in the area and coming up from other areas in the Pontiac and natural capital region.

1615 Could you tell me the clubs that use the river and the number of trips or people that take place each year on the river? Could you also tell me the various public accesses to the river for these canoes that use the river and these clubs?

1620 MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

 (Translation) Mme. Chair, that is being discussed with the owner of the supplier of the Picanoc River. It is not a private access. They are using a public access. There's no land owner who has a private access to the river. And according to the sayings of the owner of this supplier,

1625 most of the clubs start in the spring from those facilities.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1630 (Translation) Mme. Chair, the assessment of the impact has demonstrated that there will be no impact that would prevent continuing the use of the river. The uses at this time can continue even with the effluence, treated effluence. There was no impact, visual impact, noise, or water quality.

MS. MARY MASOTTI:

1635 My question was: Do they know how many people use this river, and how important it is to the canoeing community?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1640 (Translation) Mme. Chair, the number of people who do canoeing, my colleagues tell me that we don't, at this point, know the exact number, but we could look into this with the outfitter or the association to try and see how many people use that stream to do canoeing. This is the information that, if it is available, we could be sending to you.

1645 What we do know is that canoeing starts, and the lady has said so and it's part of the impact study, six (6) kilometres later than the - further away from the discharge downstream. So, it doesn't get all the way - the canoeing doesn't go all the way up to the discharge level, but the number of people who do canoeing we don't know.

1650 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) If there are people in the room here with additional information, please provide this information to us.

1655 MS. MARY MASOTTI:

1660 May I ask my question again? Because I've asked - I know that the access point that they're referring to is at Wayne Tanner's, and that is six (6) kilometres downstream. I've asked them what other accesses there are. The river is not only used for white water. It's used for other canoeing as well. And there are other points of access, and I wondered if they had looked into that.

1665 And just as a final question, and I'll leave the mike: Do they know the most famous canoeist that have used the river?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

1670 (Translation) In terms of public access points, that's the only one that is easily accessed actually, to my knowledge, in that municipality. And that last question I didn't really get, Mme. Chair.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1675 (Translation) I have the answer, a Prime Minister, I believe, Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Trudeau and his family, in fact. So, could you provide this information, in other words, not dealing with popularity? It's not a popularity contest as to the people who did canoeing there, but the access points upstream? If you do have this information, it would be useful for everybody. Please provide it to us as soon as possible.

1680

MS. MARY MASOTTI:

I will, thank you.

1685

MR. PATRICK AUTOTTE:

(Translation) Patrick Autotte, Ministry of Natural Resources, more information, it may be possible to get some idea of the number of people who do canoeing there. There is a Quebec federation of canoeing and kayak'ing. They might have information on this, as to the use of this river. There are other rivers in the area also.

1690

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1695 (Translation) The commission will be sending out a letter to that organization; Ms. Sue Rogan.

MS. SUE ROGAN:

1700 Good morning, Mme. Chair and Mr. Commissioner, I live in the Aylmer sector of the City of Gatineau and also have a cottage two (2) kilometres from Danford Lake village. Two (2) years ago, gasoline cost eighty cents (\$0.80) a litre. And I noticed this morning at the service station across the street it costs a dollar twelve cents (\$1.12). That's a twenty-five (25) to thirty percent (30%) increase in just two (2) years, and fuel costs are expected to increase even more in the future.

1705

Now, it's proposed that this landfill site serve several MRC's and the City of Gatineau. The City of Gatineau with two hundred and thirty-nine thousand (239,000) people would be the largest producer of garbage in this group.

1710 My question is this. Given the high cost of fuel and the air pollution caused by trucking the
garbage, do you think that it would be better for the environment and also better economically to
locate the garbage disposal site closer to the major source of the garbage? Whether it's a landfill
site or it's a plasma gasification plant or it's some other means of disposing of garbage,
economically, wouldn't closer be better?

1715

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

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

1720

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) I think we've already answered this question, Madam. Evidently, it would be
better for disposal projects to be located as close as possible to the major centres, but will there be
the right sites to do this nearby? And there will be just as many people to oppose it, no matter
where we try and create TLS's, Mme. Chair.

1725

I think here a gentleman said - mentioned the NIMBY syndrome. Nobody likes these
projects, no matter where we try and set them up. There's always opposition, but, in principle,
yes, of course, it would be preferable for these projects to be located as close as possible to the
major centres.

1730

MS. SUE ROGAN:

Thank you.

1735

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Ms. Annie Peck or her spokesperson.

1740

MS. LINDA CRONK (for Annie Peck):

Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, I'm Linda Cronk. I'm speaking for Ms. Annie Peck, who
is a permanent resident in Danford Lake village. She was born and brought up there. And she,
like many others in the village, are extremely frustrated and have been for the last two (2) years in
their search for information and answers at the municipal level.

1745

Citizens in the coalition of which Mrs. Peck is a member requested municipal documents to
which we were entitled. This request was refused, denied. So, a lawyer was sent to secure the
documents. Mrs. Peck wants to know whose decision it was for the Director General in the
municipality to deny having the documents to our lawyer, and then admit she had them and

1750

refused to hand them over.

1755 And I may say, at this time, the citizens are extremely frustrated again at the lack of representation from the municipality. We requested last night that we would have a question for them, and, again, they're not here.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1760 (Translation) That request was made late yesterday evening. There wasn't anybody there in the municipal offices. So, we will be posing our questions in writing, the questions that we get. So, next week, you will have an opportunity to send in written questions, and we relay them to the municipality, if need be.

MS. LINDA CRONK:

1765 Okay, I just want it noted that we've had one occasion to ask an actual representative other than the Director General any questions, thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1770 (Translation) Thank you; Mr. George McCormick.

MR. GEORGE McCORMICK:

1775 Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, my name is George McCormick. I'm a cottager in the Danford Lake area. I have a concern. We spoke this - or this was discussion this morning about the post-shutdown of the dump and the liability issues associated with that. I'm a federal public servant. I've got a little bit of experience in this area. And we talked, of course, about the polluter pays, and the operator is liable, and, you know, the - and, of course, there's the post-shutdown
1780 fund.

1785 I have some examples from the Northwest Territories, for example, the giant Yellowknife mines, it's a gold mine, and the Farrow mine, a mine in the Yukon, which is also a gold mine. They operated for about sixty (60) years. The operator went bankrupt. And, of course, now, the federal government is picking up the tab of the reclamation of that site.

1790 So, if we use the LDC example here, where it will operate for thirty (30) years, LDC then, of course goes bankrupt. And, sure, we've got the post-shutdown fund, which, of course, will help to reclaim that site, but I guess my question is: Is the Quebec government aware that they'll have to, of course, pick up the costs in the future for the reclamation of that site forever and forever? And it's going to be a substantial cost to reclaim that site. It will have to be picked up by the Quebec taxpayer.

1795 So, is the Department of Sustainable Development aware that they're going to have to pick up the cost of that site in the future?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1800 (Translation) Yes, Mme. Chair, the Ministry is aware. It has already had to confront this kind of situation. The Ministry of - our Ministry has had to confront this kind of situation where companies, either mining companies or other kinds of companies, went bankrupt, and there are sites left and no money to reclaim them, which is why, in this situation, we have set up this post-shutdown fund.

1805 And as was said yesterday, it may be that, after thirty (30) years - how should I put this - the site might still be a source of problem. If that were the case, the company would pay for this. But if the company went bankrupt, evidently we won't have any other choice than having the government take charge, but we are aware of the problem, which is why we've tried to set up this post-closure, post-shutdown management fund. Will it be liquid forever? I couldn't say.

1810

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) If you've another question, I'll ask you to send it in in writing. There's still nine (9) people left.

1815

MR. GEORGE McCORMICK:

Okay, thank you, merci.

1820

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Ms. Linda Cronk.

1825

MS. LINDA CRONK:

Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, I've introduced myself before. Again, we were frustrated as permanent residents at the municipal level at the lack of transparency in the process. We went to the MRC level and again felt very frustrated, as if we had no control in the process.

1830

Until September, 2006, the MRC Pontiac had identified three (3) different sites in the MRC as possible landfill sites, three (3) or four (4). These were chosen on soil suitability and different other factors that made them really acceptable to the MRC.

1835 Alleyn-and-Cawood was never considered to be a suitable site due at least, in part, to the nature of its soil, which is sand and gravel. All of a sudden, Alleyn-and-Cawood was added to the list of possible sites and, within a few months, was made the only site allowed in the MRC for a technical landfill.

1840 How can the MRC justify making such a high risk area the only possible location for the mega dump. Why is the MRC boxing in the people of Alleyn-and-Cawood as opposed to, say, any of the other three (3) sites that were chosen in the first place? And why are you accepting us to - forcing us to accept a high-risk venture that never should be and never was considered for this municipality in the past?

1845 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Duchesne.

1850 MR. PIERRE DUCHESNE:

1855 (Translation) Up and until we had identified the site at Danford Lake, there were two (2) potential sites, one in Bristol, which is a former mine. I forget what they used to mine there, the Elton mine, so, in that area. And the second possible site was close to the pulp and paper company, Smurf & Stone, close to Portage, which is relatively inhabited, an agricultural area on the one side of the road close to the 301, and on the other side would have been where the plant was, then the Ottawa River. And so, we had to think at other possible sites.

1860 And in the land use planning, there's mention, in fact, that the land use service had received a mandate to at least carry out an initial assessment of possible sites that might be chosen for a landfill. Now, the exercise was never really completed. And so, when the proponent came up, if I may speak using those words, we had to look into this possibility, and it became our third choice. And, in fact, there's another potential site that did become.

1865 And of these three (3) sites, it is the one that, in terms of - once again, I'm mentioning about the cohabitation, the different type of usage. This is the best one in this regard. And that's the reason why we took into account.

1870 Now, of course, in all that had already been done by the proponents, well, we asked for studies. We looked into these studies very closely. And as a resource person at the RCM, I was privileged. I was in a position to consult with them to make sure that the project would go forward in an adequate manner. I was privileged. I could have a look at these studies sometime before they were made public.

1875 And now to adequately understand the site in which they would be operating and in terms of biophysical realities and in other regards, I'm not really well positioned to say whether or not

the soil can be adequate for a TLS. My issue was to find a site apart from the other two (2) that we had already looked at, that had already been identified, but that had not been - we hadn't really thought things through in regard to those two (2). So, we had to find a site that would be the best one for this kind of set-up. So, this is how the whole thinking process occurred.

1880

MS. LINDA CRONK:

I won't belabour that right now. I know we're pressed for time, thank you.

1885

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Please don't go too far, Madam. I think you will be asking a question on behalf of Ms. McKay, right, Ms. Dorothy MacKay.

1890

MS. LINDA CRONK (for Dorothy MacKay):

Yes, Dorothy MacKay has asked me to ask a question on her behalf to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. She heard it admitted that - she heard it admitted by your colleague on Wednesday night, I believe, that, basically, you went through the motions of allowing public consultations with citizens of Alleyn-and-Cawood, all the while planning to clear the way for the establishment of this mega dump.

1895

Where is the morality of allowing this deception to continue, allowing so many citizens to sacrifice much, much time, energy, money, and destroy the social fabric of our village in the process? Is this the process at this stage still going through the motions?

1900

MR. BERNARD CHARTRAND:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, the explanation was provided Wednesday morning by the Regional Director, Pierre Ricard, and this is what the lady is mentioning. We followed up on this. You're well aware of the fact that decisions were made based on the rules of public administration for the municipality.

1905

I have no further comment in this regard. Let's not talk about morals. I did not deal with that notion Wednesday morning. Mr. Ricard clearly explained all throughout the day the whole process that was used. There was a decision made in the municipal council in Alleyn-and-Cawood and decisions made by the RCM, and there's a whole concept of the RCI decision.

1910

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) You may deal with this issue or your perception of it during the second

1915

phase of the public hearings. Ms. MacKay can do this as well in her brief, for instance, or she may come and orally give a presentation, thank you; Mr. André Carrière.

1920 MR. ANDRE CARRIERE:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, I'll be asking this question in English. It is addressed to the proponent or the operator.(End of translation)

1925 Are there any agreements made by the promoter with any parties that could give rise to claims by the promoter against such parties, should the government decide that the project should not go ahead? For example, LDC has incurred significant costs over the past few years. Would the promoter view such expenditures as simply the price paid for marketing his proposal, or would he seek to recover some of the costs from the municipality of Alton and Cawood or the MRC Pontiac?

1930

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) No.

1935

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) The promoter takes full charge and runs the risk when he sends in a notice of project and an assessment study, and the government is not bound to say either yes or no when this is filed.

1940

MR. ANDRE CARRIERE:

(Translation) Thank you.

1945

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mr. Paul Dingledine, did I get it right?

1950 MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

Mme. Chairman, you did it right, thank you very much. I am used to all kinds of pronunciation. So, I'm not bothered by that. Thank you very much, Mme. Chairman. My name is Paul Dingledine. I have one final question on the number of trucks.

1955

All the numbers we have seen and talked about over the last day or two (2) relate to the number of trucks that are carrying garbage to the site and their return to their point of origin, but a site of this magnitude is a huge operation. There will be all kinds of trucks required just to

1960 operate it quite apart from the garbage. There'll be service vehicles. There'll be probably some sand that has to be brought in. There'll be equipment and so forth.

1965 In addition to that, the proponent proposes that there be a recycling centre, more trucks coming, going away. A wood kiln, there'll be trucks that are bringing wet wood in and taking dry wood out. There's composting, municipality waste water plants, all these ancillary activities, but we have no numbers for the number of trucks that these are all going to trigger. And that's a very important factor for us to consider, what the impact will be upon the highways and upon the people and all the things we've talked about over the last couple of days.

1970 So, my question is a simple one to the team here. How many trucks will these activities trigger? And I just would note that these things show up on the maps. So, they must have some idea of how much wood will go to the wood kiln, and how much municipal sludge there'll be, and so forth. So, there should be some way of coming up with an estimate.

1975 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You have estimated that if the project goes ahead that, at max. during the operations, there would be sixty-one (61) trips. We said one hundred and twenty-two (122). So, that's two (2) way per day. What does this include? Have you forgotten all the other types of transportation mentioned by Mr. Dingledine? And if so, what would be the overall total for those trucks or those trips?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

1985 (Translation) Mr. Commissioner, before I give the floor to my colleague who specializes in road traffic, Patrick Gagnon, I would like to rectify things as to the number or the issue of the kiln mentioned by the gentleman.

1990 Initially for the project, I'd like to mention that, initially, the project was CIEVO, the centre for innovation and burial and remediation in the Outaouais. It was called CIEVO using the acronym.

1995 After consultation during the presentation period, the open-doors day, and meeting with the population, I fully remember that the members of the watchdog committee and the population at large told us what is this all about, this kiln, this plasma kiln, or what have you, to remediate the organic sludge, the residual sludge. This is risky. We don't want this kind of plasma kiln. And so, we then were asked in a letter to take that out. So, then, we decided to take away the acronym CIEVO and not do energy reclamation for the sludge.

2000 As to the number of trucks now that, you know, on the site of operations, I'll give the floor to Patrick.

MR. PATRICK GAGNON:

2005 (Translation) Good morning, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, now, transportation, it must be mentioned that when we look at this kind of site, transportation is one of the criteria that we look at. As an engineering firm, we do multi-criteria analysis, and we would be using the roads provided by the Ministry of Transportation.

2010 I must remind us that LDC is not a carrier, but nevertheless we've gone through the exercise of looking at trucking using maximum tonnage and taking into account the little variances. We even added twenty-five percent (25%) for - in terms of noise. So, we can integrate all the different variables. I could deal with a specific case of this or that plant, anything that could be added into the sector. We've taken all of this into account by adding twenty-five percent (25%) in. That was factored in.

2015 I'd like to add that the road network that the Ministry of Transportation intends to develop will be used to develop the region economically. And so, the 105 and the 301 have been mentioned in terms of a trucking network to develop the region. And possibly the Ministry of Transportation could add a few words in this regard.

2020 And we cannot prevent people from using the roads, but we did go through the exercise and analyzed in a very broad radius. As Mr. Poulin mentioned, generally, we analyzed a site in a more limited radius, but we looked at it taking into account the whole region, so to speak. So, we went through the exercise trying to be professional and go beyond the regular criteria and to look at a regional impact.

2025 So, that's my answer. Maybe the Ministry of Transportation could speak about that upper portion of the road network.

2030 MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

2035 In short, I don't need an answer from the Ministry of Transport. I just need an answer from these people. I thought I had a simple question, but evidently not. Just to clarify, the municipal sludge plant is out. That's not happening. The wood kiln is still there, I think. And if it's still there, how many trucks does it take?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2040 (Translation) Yes, indeed, the kiln energy reclamation, yes, of biogas is part of the kiln, the wood kiln, but if I'm not mistaken, the trucks transporting the lumber or the logs, well, that is part. I mean this would not be extra trucks. These are trucks that are using the roads at present. So, evidently, if they go to the site, they will be going through using the 301 going into the site to get the wood to dry out there.

2045 So, I might say that these are included in the twenty-five percent (25%) that I factored in, assuming that these are new trucks, additional trucks, that usually don't use the 301, but to bring in the wood to be dried using the biogas, they would be using the 301, although previously they might not have.

2050 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, how many a day would that be, the number of trucks, that you might anticipate that might go and use this service? Are you in a position to answer? I mean what kind of demand can you meet, what capacity in terms of drying the wood?

2055

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Well, the amount of biogas to be produced and used for reclamation, well, not initially, of course, only when there is enough biogas, so, time will be needed for this to happen. And the quantity of wood, the two by four's (2 x 4's), say, or lumber, I would say no more than one (1) or two (2) trucks a week at most, at the very, very most. It takes a long time to be able to dry wood. So, given the amount of biogas that will be generated, I think we're not talking about more than one (1) or two (2) trucks a week.

2060

2065 MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

And for the recycling?

2070

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) For the recycling, Madam, that's what's so nice about this whole notion, this whole project. The trucks, the basic notion is as follows. Some trucks will be coming in bringing in waste in trailers, and we've looked at the possibility of cleaning the trailer. After it's clean, we could put in or transfer the recyclable waste, sending them into this trailer, which would take this back to Gatineau. So, it's not one additional truck. It's the very same truck. Instead of going back empty, it will go back with recyclable material.

2075

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) (...) Pontiac RCM, and so, those products come into the inverse sense from Campbell Bay to the site and not from Kazabazua to the site.

2080

MR. PAUL DINGLEDINE:

2085 I find this a very imprecise answer, but I recognize that that's the best we're going to get

today. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2090 (Translation) Mrs. Laura Raymond, you have a proxy.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

2095 (Translation) Just a correction very quick about the plasma kiln and the sludge, I can answer, because I was the one who spoke about that in October, 2005. I did not say I was opposed to the plasma kiln, on the contrary, but I said that since, in the region, we had already accepted as responsible citizens to have something in our area, it would be the plant from our RCM, but we did not want to have other trucks carrying the sludge, septic sludge, from other regions of the Outaouais. That's all.

2100 Now, someone mentioned earlier - sorry, can I go back to take my notes? A question was asked about the risk of Court action in case the project did not go forward, and Mr. Rouleau said, no, it was a risk, a natural risk, in his project. And so, he would not claim anything.

2105 However, during the whole of 2006, the Mayor tried in vain to convince the citizens that the only reason why, after having given the green light, he could not withdraw his support was that he feared Court action from the promoter. And that is why he could not withdraw his support anymore. He even added several times during council meetings that he was waiting for his lawyer to provide him with some advice about this.

2110 So, I would like to know the truth about this. Was there, yes or not, any threats of Court action against the municipality in case he had withdrawn his support?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2115 (Translation) There has been no threat at all from LDC, Mme. Chair.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2120 (Translation) Let's not talk about threats.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2125 (Translation) No notice, no information at all that we intended to take Court action in case the support was withdrawn.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2130 (Translation) Now, do you think there would be a possibility that you could take such a step?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2135 (Translation) No, I don't see that.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

2140 (Translation) Thank you very much; so, we have to conclude that the Mayor lied to his citizens for more than a year.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Well, that is your opinion; Mr. Jacques Raymond.

2145 MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

2150 (Translation) Good morning, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, my name is Jacques Raymond. My wife and I own a cottage at Lake Danford, Danford Lake, about two (2) kilometres from the spot. I'm the second generation of owners. My question is as follows. The gentleman said a while ago that they had made studies about gasification, and it was not good. I'd like him to clarify his position, because he's a scientist. What studies were done to validate that information?

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2155 (Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; Mr. Poulin will answer.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2160 (Translation) I did not - I'm sorry, Mme. Chair, I did not say that gasification was not a good process. What I said is that when it had been proposed, there had been some apprehensions relating to transportation or relating to the technology. I would like to go back to the transcriptions of that meeting to know what were the apprehensions or concerns of the population relating to the plasma technology.

2165 Mme. Chair, I am personally responsible of a project, with a plasma project, and we are at this time, with Hydro Quebec and Fabgroups Technology, installing that plasma technology in Valleyfield to treat all the residual sludge of the Beauharnois/Salaberry municipality. So, I'm not

opposed to the technology. On the contrary, I am a strong proponent or user of that technology. I'm an engineer proposing that technology.

2170

However, the project that we're working on at this time, LDC is not a private proponent owning the - or providing a plasma technology. LDC is a - does management and provides environmental services. So, LDC provides technologies and relating to disposal of residual matter, residual waste, but so the project has been suggested to use the residual sludge, was part of a range of technologies. There was no problem there.

2175

However, I come back to the matter of costs. One of the factors that have been discussed at the start was that would the gasification or oxidation or HOP, is that affordable technology? We know that the project that is in Ottawa at this time, from what I read on the Internet site, by the promoter, Plasco, will cost about thirty (30) million dollars for twenty-seven thousand (27,000) tons per year. So, thirty (30) million dollars for thirty thousand (30,000) tons, let's say, that is a relatively expensive technology, and it is more expensive than a TLS.

2180

The other point, Mme. Chair, is that the operating costs are directly proportional to the resale of electricity or the energy produced. So, you have to be close to the user or a consumer of energy. In the Pontiac municipality, there is no hospital, no major user.

2185

The only way to resell the power to reduce the cost of operating the plant would be to connect to the Hydro Quebec network. At this time, there is no existing project to use urban biomass to produce electricity in Quebec. There had been a project, but the call for tenders were cancelled.

2190

So, the technology of re-gasification is a very good technology, but you're talking of one hundred (\$100.00), one hundred fifty dollars (\$150.00) a ton. So, that is not in the range that was mentioned for landfill.

2195

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, this question is more for Natural Resources relating to the power issue. There was also the possibility to get energy for the producers - to open the possibility that the private producers could sell energy to Hydro Quebec.

2200

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

(Translation) Indeed, and, at this time, the environmental assessments branch of the Ministry of the Environment for all the projects higher than two dollars (\$2.00) per - two (2) tons per hour, the impact study regulation relates that to the environmental impact assessment. And so, that is the problem that Hydro Quebec and other groups have.

2205

2210 On the projects that are more than two (2) tons per hour, that is sixteen thousand (16,000) tons per year, all those projects are subject to impact studies, public hearings, and so on. And so, there is a problem at this time, because those projects of power production through that technology have to go through the whole process of public hearings.

2215 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) It's not necessarily a problem.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2220

(Translation) Well, I'm not saying it's a problem, but if each time we want to establish such a project with new technology, one has to go through a process. When it's a project of fifty thousand (50,000) or one hundred thousand (100,000) tons or, here, two hundred fifty thousand (250,000) tons per year, there's no problem, but, for a small project, for a small station where it's only ten thousand (10,000) tons a year, going through the process that takes two (2) to three (3) years, it's very expensive, very costly.

2225

THE COMMISSIONER:

2230 (Translation) You said, Mr. Poulin, you're referred to a cost of thirty (30) million dollars for thirty thousand (30,000) tons.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2235 (Translation) Well, the Plasco project, I think the best person to answer those questions would be - there is a representative from Plasco in the room.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2240 (Translation) I just want to check on the figures to make sure I understood. You said thirty (30) million dollars for thirty thousand (30,000) tons.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2245 (Translation) So, it's one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) per ton. That is the investment required. It's not the operating cost, and it does not include transportation costs, either.

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

2250 (Translation) Now, about that technology, we were told at that meeting that the cost would be sixty-six dollars (\$66.00) per trip for treating the waste. Let's leave those figures aside

for the time being. My question is for the Ministry of Environment and the government. The wastes were buried by cavemen. We're in 2007. When are we going to use a new technology to get rid of our problems, to solve our problems?

2255

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Okay, we'll get an answer for that.

2260

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

(Translation) You can provide an answer in writing, if you wish.

2265

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; unfortunately, the Ministry of the Environment does not necessarily assess technologies. After having passed the regulation, if you have the time to look at the regulation, it deals with landfill technologies as well as burning technologies, incineration. So, if a promoter comes up with a project, whether it be landfill or incineration, that project will be assessed, but the Ministry has no preference at all for one technology instead of another. Both are considered on an equal basis.

2270

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

(Translation) But perhaps we could avoid such - building such a site or postpone it until a new technology has been developed, because we're talking of a large site. I think, a few years from now, that might not be required.

2275

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2280

(Translation) Well, you can deal with that issue in your brief.

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

(Translation) Now, about the leachate, I had understood there would be a sample taken each week. Could you tell me what quantity of liquid would that represent?

2285

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2290

(Translation) Daily quantity or...

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

(Translation) No, the volume for the sampling, how much liquid would be taken to do - to

2295 sample, to do the samples?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Only the sample.

2300

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

(Translation) The volume of the sample.

2305

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Alright.

2310

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) Thank you, Mme. Chair; André Poulin.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2315

(Translation) There is a sampling guide --

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

2320

(Translation) Sorry, just give me an estimate. I don't need explanations. Is it a glass or a litre?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2325

(Translation) Well, no, the sample has to - for twenty-four (24) hours, you have to take out at least three (3) litres of water to do proper analysis.

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

2330

(Translation) Another question, how much leachate comes out from the site each week? What is the volume? Do you need your calculator here?

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2335

(Translation) Yves has a calculator, but it's three hundred (300) cubic metres. I'm always talking about maximums.

MR. YVES GAGNON:

2340 (Translation) Sorry, Mme. Chair, as was mentioned, the maximum anticipated flow, when we're at the end of using the site, we're talking of about two hundred forty-one (241) cubic metres per day. That would be the maximum flow. And one has to understand that at the beginning - I mean that volume will change, will increase with time relatively to the area that is increased, but let's take the maximum.

2345 You have two hundred forty-one (241) cubic metres, so, two hundred forty-one thousand (241,000) litres per day multiplied by seven (7). So, that is the figure you want, per week, which is one thousand six hundred eighty-seven (1,687) metres, cubic metres, per day - per week.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2350 (Translation) Well, you can deal with the issue in your brief, because now you have the figures.

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

2355 (Translation) Yes, but my question was that, scientifically, does the sample represent the situation, the true situation?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2360 (Translation) Sustainable Development, Environment Ministry.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2365 (Translation) Mr. Michel is going to answer that question.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

2370 (Translation) Mme. Chair, what is important is not one sample one time that will give you a good indication of the quality of the water. It's a series of samples that will be taken over time.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2375 (Translation) So, you will be able to check if there is a change in the quality of the effluence.

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

(Translation) Yes, and if there is treatment of the leachates, one sample is not

2380 necessarily representative. There might be different problems with the sampling or with the analysis, but when you have several samples over time, then you have a good idea of the quality of the leachate.

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

2385

(Translation) Now, if you did a polling, would that methodology be acceptable?

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2390

(Translation) Well, let's only deal with the scientific matters, because you can have a perception, but we're trying to deal with scientific methodologies. It's the Ministry that evaluates or assesses the recurrence or how frequently a sampling has to be taken, and that is a minimum once a week. If, at a given time, there is a problem that has appeared, do you then take more frequent samples? If you see that the situation is getting worse, can you ask for more samples, more frequent samples according to Clause 22, for instance?

2395

MR. MICHEL BOURRET:

2400

(Translation) Well, obviously, if there is a problem, then effluent has to be stopped. And before continuing the operation, samples will have to demonstrate that the quality of water is acceptable according to the standards.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2405

(Translation) Thank you, sir; you can deal with the rest in your brief.

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

2410

(Translation) Well, we talked about the polluter who pays. When - why don't we talk about the principle of the consumer who pollutes? In other words, if it costs money to do the sampling, people have to realize that when they consume, they pollute, and they will have to pay.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2415

(Translation) Thank you; you can develop that idea in your brief, as I said. We have four (4) persons, Mrs. Michèle Borchers.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

2420

(Translation) I believe it has been clearly indicated over the past few days that the Mayor

and the council have chosen to exclude seventy-five percent (75%) of the taxpayers, since they took a count only of the permanent residents in their consultations, and also when they selected organizations to be consulted, because many organizations that are opposed were not consulted. Now, is that approach not unsatisfactory according to your guidelines, since it says that all the relevant persons should be consulted?

2425

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Well, it's always as far as possible. We do not have to do a survey to know if some people who were supposed to be met or consulted were or not consulted. It says according to possibilities, if possible. It is not compulsory.

2430

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) No, but the basic principle here is that it should not be demonstrated - it's not compulsory. It is desirable, according to the guideline, that most of the population has to be consulted, right?

2435

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) You're a hundred percent (100%) right, and I believe, in the guideline, that is the way it is expressed in the guideline.

2440

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, you can deal with that issue in your brief; Mr. Ray Thomas.

2445

MR. OTA HORA:

(Translation) I'm Ota Hora on behalf of Ray Thomas. I thank Ray Thomas. Another question: I see a big lack of consultation between the municipal - regional municipalities and the populations. According to your experience, do you believe that - is this a typical situation that you've experienced in your research of other dumps, that there's this - we arrive at the BAPE hearings, and there's all of these loose ends being tied. Was there this amount of turmoil in your other experience?

2450

2455

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Well, we'll discuss those issues in our report. That's the only time when we can express an opinion.

2460

MR. OTA HORA:

2465 Merci, une question for the Environment: Cantley is an example of failed environmental laws and policies, I feel, according to the reports in the media. I don't know how accurate that is or not. My question is: What is the Ministry of Environment going to do to tighten up regulations, so that when we do proceed with a landfill solution in the Outaouais that we don't run into the similar problems, if problems do arise?

2470 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

 (Translation) Mme. Chair, I don't know if you want a general answer or a specific answer specific to the case of Cantley.

2475 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

 (Translation) No, give us a general answer.

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

2480 (Translation) Well, generally speaking, it is quite sure that - well, do we have to change the legislation and regulations? No, not necessarily, but it's more a matter of making sure that the delinquent promoter respects the legislation and regulations. It's not because the legislation or the regulations are not good. It's because they are not satisfied. The criteria are not satisfied.

2485

MR. OTA HORA:

2490 A final comment, I'm very impressed with this process. I appreciate being part of it. I want it on the record that I am committed to be a part of the solution. I am not here to discredit anyone. When I ask questions, it's to come up with solutions for everyone. And the feeling I have during this whole process is I feel everyone is in the same position. We are all trying to come up with the best solution for all of us, because we all have a responsibility to each other. So, I want to thank everyone that has participated, thank you very much.

2495 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

 (Translation) You told us that you had another question. I will ask you to send it in writing, but you can ask it now.

2500 MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

 (Translation) Sorry, Mme. Chair, just a clarification, the dumps of dry material, dry waste, won't exist anymore. So, no new ones could be built or set up.

2505 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Alright, thank you; you've had your answers, but you can also send questions in writing until Friday. I have one other name, Mr. George McCormick, a final name on my list.

2510

MR. GEORGE McCORMICK:

Merci, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, just a couple of questions: As far as the hydrogen sulphide, how will that be collected? And I guess the other question is concerning methane gas. Will that be flared? So, two (2) questions: methane gas and hydrogen sulphide collection and flaring.

2515

MR. YVES GAGNON:

(Translation) Mme. Chair, there is an obligation by virtue of the new regulation that we should get the biogas that are generated within the sites and burn all of this gas. So, this gas has a lot of methane. There's also H₂S. So, these compounds, as others, by the way, that we find in the biogas will be destroyed through incineration. This is what we expect to be doing within the project, and this is in compliance with the new regulations, by the way.

2520

2525

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Please come to the mike.

2530

MR. JACQUES RAYMOND:

(Translation) Incineration now, would this produce odours, sulphur odours?

MR. YVES GAGNON:

2535

(Translation) No, that's it. When there is incineration of these compounds, they are destroyed during incineration.

THE COMMISSIONER:

2540

(Translation) How effective is this destruction, or what does the regulation provide for?

MR. YVES GAGNON:

2545

(Translation) The Ministry can tell me if I'm wrong, but I believe it's ninety-eight percent

(98%) or more of the destruction rate that is required, and these incinerators can be found in many landfill sites, anyways. There is also many in Quebec: in Lachenaie, Ste. Sophie, Sherbrooke, and so on. And these technologies are - how should I put this - have been demonstrated to be effective and efficient over a number of years now.

2550

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

2555

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Do you have a final statement in closing, Mr. Proponent?

2560

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

(Translation) No, quite simply thank you very much, Mme. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, as well as all of the interveners, and everyone, thank you very much.

2565

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Now, the resource persons, have you anything to add, any further information to provide at this point? In that case, this is it for the first phase of the public hearings.

2570

I'd like to remind you that, up until Friday, the 25th of May, you may send in your additional questions in writing. These questions will then be owned by the commission. We will deal with them as we have dealt with these matters during the whole hearings. In other words, when they have been answered already, the analysts will simply indicate that you may find the answers in the transcripts. The commission will also be in a position to go further in order to respect its mandate.

2575

The second phase of the hearings will be held as of June 12th in the heritage room in the municipality of Low. We will see then, depending on the number of briefs that - or oral declarations that we expect for the second phase, if we need to go to other townships as well.

2580

Now, the goal of the second phase of the public hearing consists in receiving your opinions. So, this is open to everybody. What is required is for you to tell us as soon as possible, through the commission, that you want to be there, so that adequate time can be set aside, and that we can have an adequate venue. If this can be done by next week, that would be great, as soon as possible, the sooner the better.

2585

As for your briefs, we would greatly appreciate to be receiving them no later than Friday.

2590 I believe the date is June 8th, yes, the Friday just before the second phase, before the 12th of June. So, I believe that's the 8th of June, so that we may then have enough time to read them and to prepare our questions.

2595 We will be setting aside twenty-five (25) minutes per presentation. If anybody says I won't be that long, well, we'll see. We'll adapt, but there will be time for your presentation and time for an exchange with the commission within that twenty-five (25) minute period.

2600 The second phase now, we'll do things quite differently. Everybody is asked to come, but we won't be having a table for the promoter or for the resource people, although you can come, of course. You're quite welcome. After all, you will have to be working on these issues and dealing with the management of waste. This might be useful for you to acquire more experience. Public hearings are useful in this regard.

2605 So, the register is open. If anything was said during the presentation or the briefs or contained in a brief that is erroneous, you may put your name in the register as the proponent, resource person, or anybody, participant, if you want to rectify things to get the facts clear, but I'm simply talking about facts here, nothing but the facts as opposed to presenting an opinion.

2610 Everybody is allowed to have their own opinion, but things must be done in a respectful manner, as has been done, and this was great. All the participants here were respectful. We congratulate you on behalf of the whole team and the commission.

So, then, all the transcripts will be made available in approximately one week in both official languages on the Internet site of the commission and in the different consultation centres.

2615 On behalf of the commission, I would like to thank all of the participants, the proponent for his diligence in answering the questions and the good faith in providing answers. I think it was greatly appreciated by everybody. I thank you, and we feel confident that you will go on working in the same way all throughout the commission's mandate.

2620 To all the resource persons now, thank you for all of your energy answering these questions, thank you very much. It was greatly appreciated by everybody. We had excellent comments at the commission's secretariat, thank you. We are confident that you, too, will go on providing us with good answers in writing, if need be, if the commission felt that it had to ask for your cooperation in the coming weeks.

2625 And thank you also to the whole team, the commission's team, the analysts, the secretariat, and all the whole team, thank you; the stenotypists, you had concentrate considerably. We know that you provide quality work, thank you very much, Ms. Maisonneuve, Ms. Rinaldi.

2630 Thank you as well to the interpreters, translators. We know that they've done remarkable
work. People have come to tell us that they greatly appreciated your work. Thank you says the
interpreters, thank you. Mr. Bernard Proulx, the interpreter, Mr. Jean-Michel Gazet, Yasmine
Norris, Jean-Michel Gazet, Greg Pollack, and, finally, thank you to all of the participants. There
was also Karine Rosbach.

2635 Thank you to others for abiding by the rules. You worked very hard, as was seen all
throughout this first phase. And I believe everybody greatly appreciated your overall attitude, the
respect that you have shown with regard to every participant, and this honours you. See you next
time.

2640 -----
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
2645 public hearings conducted by the BAPE.

AND I HAVE SIGNED:

2650 _____
ANNAGRET RINALDI,
Official Court Reporter.