

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

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

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

SECOND PHASE

VOLUME 1

Hearing held June 12, 2007, 19 h
Salle Héritage
4C, chemin d'Amour
Low

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF BRIEFS :

MUNICIPALITÉ DE LOW

MICHAEL FRANCIS..... 3

CHARLENE SCHARF 6

ANNE CHENG, LEE RECK..... 10

MRC DE LA VALLÉE-DE-LA-GATINEAU

RÉJEAN CARLE, CATHERINE LUSSIER, PIERRE RONDEAU..... 15

ÉRIC FRÉGEAULT 26

DENISE LAROCQUE-RENAUD 30

MICHÈLE BORCHERS 34

MUNICIPALITÉ DE LA PÊCHE

ROBERT BUSSIÈRES..... 43

MARIE-THÉRÈSE KASEEF 48

RIGHT OF CORRECTION :

JEAN MBARAGA, MDDEP 48

DENIS ROULEAU 51

ANDRÉ POULIN..... 51

MS. CLAUDETTE JOURNAULT,
THE CHAIRWOMAN:

5 (Translation) Good evening and welcome to the second portion for a landfill site
implementation in the municipality. And I am Claudette Journault. I will be presiding this public
hearing, and I have the responsibility of looking after this issue that was entrusted to me by Lynne
Beauchamps. We have Mr. Donald Labrie, who will be my partner. I will introduce the team that
10 accompanies the commission.

The analysts - is there a problem with the sound? Is there a problem with translation?
15 Maybe they have to change the channels. You have to be on the right channel. Maybe you can
suggest that they use the same channel as you. The analysts for the commission - can you hear
us now? So, can you tell me when you're ready? It's okay? Thank you.

So, we are going to start over again. The analysts that are with the commission, Jean
20 Roberge and Jasmin Bergeron, who are with us, and we have in the team Monique Lajoie as well.

And the coordinator for the secretariat of the commission, Mrs. Renée Poliquin, and some
25 people have dealt with her during the last few days, and I take this opportunity to thank her for this
excellent work. And she attempted to satisfy about a hundred (100) people who communicated
with her, who wanted to find a place where they could express their views at the commission.

The responsible person for the citizens' communication, communication with the press,
30 Jean-Sébastien Fillion, who is looking after this task, and the commission is also assisted with the
Centre partagé de Québec, Mr. Michel Filteau, who is looking after the technical aspect and the
logistics, and Mr. Martin Lajoie, who looks after the sound system.

All the - everything will be re-transcribed by Lise Maisonneuve and Annagret Rinaldi, who
35 are official stenographers. And the simultaneous translation are offered by Service de traduction
du Nord, Andrew Lamontagne and Nicole Groleau, who are - who will be the official interpreters.

We have had on May 15th to the 18th the first portion of the hearings, a session that
40 allowed us to go and get all the information to learn all about the impacts, and this will allow the
citizens to express their opinions on the project and to make comments and make suggestions and
to propose modifications to the project.

So, we're asking people who are registered to present a brief to go to the secretariat at the
back, unless you've done it already, to advise the secretariat that you are present.

45 The time allotted for each presentation including the questions from the commission and the exchange with you is twenty-five (25) minutes total. So, I will tell you, after about fifteen (15) minutes, that you have taken fifteen (15) minutes, and it's up to you, and you can take twenty-five (25) minutes to make your presentations and present your point of views or give us some time to discuss with you to go into depth into certain views. It would be appreciated, if we could exchange a few words with you.

50 If the time allows us, we are going to allow some people who have registered this evening to come and present their briefs. However, it's not a sure thing for this evening, because the time is all calculated and completed. So, if we have five (5), ten (10) minutes, we can use it for the people who will have shown an interest in presenting themselves.

55 So, during this second part of the hearing, the people with the commission are invited to be here, and we'll hear all about the point of views, but do not have a specific role to play.

60 So, it's one of eight (8) meetings that will be taking place this week. Tonight, we have eight (8) presentations, and sessions will continue here in the Heritage Room tomorrow afternoon from one o'clock (1:00) until five o'clock (5:00) and from seven (7:00) until eleven (11:00) tomorrow night. And then, we will be in Otter Lake at seven o'clock (7:00) Thursday night, and then Friday, one o'clock (1:00), and Friday night, and then Saturday morning, and Saturday afternoon.

65 We want to keep a serene climate just like it has been in the first portion of the hearings. So, there should be no disrespectful comments that will be tolerated and no manifestation of approval or disapproval.

70 We want to underline the fact that, like the promoters, the resource people, you have the possibility to rectify facts that have been mentioned in the briefs during your presentation. So, this right will serve uniquely to rectify facts and not to be favourable to opinions that have been expressed. It's not a debate. It's more or less the possibility to give the right facts to the commission.

75 So, you can be registered at the back of the room, if you know that there are some informations that are inexact and you could tell us the right facts, and you will have the chance to do it until next Thursday of next week. You can do it in writing.

80 However, the commission will accept compliments to briefs that will have also been received until Friday, the 22nd of June. This is to take into account the fact that some answers will have come in late. And so, then, you will be able to become aware of it, if you want to complete your briefs.

85 And in the hearings, the commission is pursuing its study and examination, and this will be posted to the consultation centres and to - in the centres of documentation of the BAPE. You can find it there.

90 Following the second part of the public hearings, the commission will draft their report for the Minister of Sustainable Development and Parks, and this will mention your concerns and the analysis of the commission regarding the study project. And a report will be given to the Minister on the 15th of September at the latest, and the Minister will have sixty (60) days to make this report public.

95 And in the same vein, with the works of the commission, the Sustainable Development Department is preparing an environmental analysis that will be submitted to the Minister, and it is starting from these two (2) reports that the Minister will form an opinion on the project, and prepare a decree of project, and give her decision from the Minister's office.

100 Plus, the documents, the briefs, those that have not been presented publicly and the transcription of these public hearings would also be submitted as well. In the next few weeks, any new information obtained by the commission will be made public and be attached to the public hearings.

105 We want to know that the Office of Public Hearings on Environment is making a declaration to the citizens, and the organization is putting at your disposal services to decide whether the services were satisfactory, and we want you to fill a questionnaire when you come into the room.

110 So, we are going to begin immediately with the first person on the list. So, we are inviting the Mayor of the municipality of Low, Mr. Michael Francis.

110 MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

115 (Translation) Mr. and Mrs. Commissioner, welcome, as well as your team; I see in the room a lot of my colleagues, citizens, and friends as well, who are happy to be able to come in front of you to present their brief concerning this very important project in the Outaouais Valley. If you will allow me, since my mother tongue is English, I will do it in English. I have complete trust in your translating team. So, thank you for listening to me, and welcome to Low. (Presentation of brief)

120 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Just out of respect, we would ask you not to really applaud, please.

MR. DONALD LABRIE,
THE COMMISSIONER:

125

(Translation) So, if the technology of the LET seems to be the most economical to dispose of its waste and that the other alternative technologies cost a bit more, would your municipality be ready to pay a little more to dispose of these wastes? Just how much more are you willing to pay?

130

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

135

The people of the municipality of Low are certainly prepared to pay for ultimate waste disposal that is environmentally sound, that has a known cost out into the future, including beyond the thirty (30) year horizon for operation of this LET, and beyond which there is proposed to set aside several millions of dollars for mitigation measures which must be anticipated.

THE COMMISSIONER:

140

(Translation) But in terms of percentage, a little more, just how much more?

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

145

(Translation) I don't have the information, the concrete information, but it's based on cost per taxpayer to have an LET, even if it's not far. I have certain guaranteed costs by a company that I do not represent. I have no interest, whether financial or other, that I find that that company meets the mentioned - principle mentioned by the MRC and the citizens close to the source disposal of waste.

THE COMMISSIONER:

150

(Translation) Another question, in your municipality, the residual matters coming from industry and businesses, are they collected by the entrepreneur? Could it be a different entrepreneur?

155

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

160

(Translation) Yes, it could be. To date, we find that to have one contractor that is responsible for all the waste, whether the domestic or from commercial sources or even industrial waste, because we have certain industries, but up until now we find - we just signed a new contract for five (5) years with a contractor, and we find that to have the same contractor to collect all the waste is the best - and to a place that's close to the municipality is the best way to operate.

THE COMMISSIONER:

165 (Translation) It is a preferable approach, but could another entrepreneur offer - could it be possible that another entrepreneur would collect these wastes?

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

170 (Translation) Yes, it's possible. With the contract that we have now, it could generate a modification of their contract, but it could also have - since we just signed a contract, we received a lot of quotes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

175 (Translation) I'm not talking about this contract in particular.

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

180 (Translation) Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

185 (Translation) After five (5) years, is it possible --

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

190 (Translation) Yes, it's possible to do it, but I don't see an advantage to do it. With the volume that we experience right now, I don't see the advantage.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

195 (Translation) In your brief, you talk of CO₂'s that will be created by the transportation, but let's talk about transportation. You would favour some technology in a localization that is - a site that is closer. What would the management be like of all these residual waste, if it - farther from Gatineau or if they come from further north?

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

200 (Translation) From the point of view in terms of transportation, given the volumes of waste that come from these different areas, even remote areas, we find that the smaller quantities will be from further away. With a system, according to my knowledge, with a system of network or a network that will facilitate, that is in place, and that will receive two hundred (200)

tons a day or a few other tons, that will be profitable.

205

The effects related to transportation, like CO₂ gas emissions related to transportation, especially the great quantities that come from the city, and it also has to do with the domestic waste coming from smaller areas, they wouldn't need to be transported all the way to town, because they're farther away, but they wouldn't need to go that far. So, with the transportation, you know, you have to really find some efficiency, especially with waste that come further away.

210

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, the LET that would have the dimension to receive the waste from Pontiac, how do you see that?

215

MAYOR MICHAEL FRANCIS:

(Translation) I wouldn't think it's beneficial. I'm not - according to my knowledge, I don't think it would be viable, but I'm not an expert, so, especially since our sanitary department says we don't think it's going to be viable. So, we have about the same size, the same dimension, as Pontiac. Thank you very much.

220

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

225

(Translation) Now, we'd like to call upon Charlene Scharf.

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

230

(Presentation of brief)

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you; do you understand me now? Well, we saw in the first part of the hearing that there's a difficulty with social peace with the site that was established in your community for the last few years. We had a lot of witnesses come up and talk about this, and we see it in briefs. So, how do you see this reconciliation? Is it possible, and what are the elements that could allow it?

235

240

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

The community is definitely divided by this project. There - the people who are for the project are saying they're a majority. The people who are against are saying they're the majority. I think the proper step for the municipality to have taken would have been an official survey taken

245 from our rate payers, finding out exactly what the majority does feel, instead of I'm right/you're wrong.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

250 (Translation) Very well, but some people feel that a surveillance committee would - could be an approach used to allow the public to be heard or have the concerns voiced. Up to now, there's no approach that really worked. Do you think a surveillance committee, a credible one that works well, could help and work with the concerned population?

255 MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

By surveillance committee, you're meaning like a mediating kind of thing or...

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

260

(Translation) A citizens' committee, because the law obligates managers of waste disposal sites to have - they obligate them to have a surveillance committee. The disposal sites must automatically have a surveillance committee, but it has to work well. People - there can't be much turnover, people quitting their jobs. It has to be a place of conciliation, a place where people can

265

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

I would hope that it would.

270

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) But there's no magic formula? Is there a formula that you know?

275 MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

It's a difficult situation within the municipality right now.

THE COMMISSIONER:

280

(Translation) Madam, you're a member of the municipal council. How long have you been an elected official?

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

285

All tolled, almost nine (9) years.

THE COMMISSIONER:

290 (Translation) So, well before you heard about this project, but at what - tell me, how did the project occur? Who is the first to know of it?

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

295 I came in in a by-election in 2005. The negotiations with LDC had already started at that time. I was informed, when I asked questions, that LDC had approached the municipality with the program.

THE COMMISSIONER:

300 (Translation) Okay, so, at what time did you meet the promoter for the first time? It's during a council meeting or a meeting - a closed hearing, during a private meeting?

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

305 It was at a private meeting, but I did know Mr. Rouleau prior to.

THE COMMISSIONER:

310 (Translation) That time, you were made aware of the extent of the project at that time, the scope of it.

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

315 At first, it sounded good. It was all the positives that you were hearing, possible employment for our rate payers, our residents, wonderful things that he could provide the community with that - we're not a big community, and we have little funds. So, it all sounded really good, until the environmental questions started coming around and the heavier traffic on the highways.

320

THE COMMISSIONER:

325 (Translation) In your brief, you're referring - you refer to incentives, financial incentives, that were supposedly offered to council members or to the families. What nature were these incentives? Were they job offers for the protected site if ever it was constructed or any other types of incentives?

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

330 Oh, boy...

THE COMMISSIONER:

335 (Translation) So, if you don't want to answer, you can tell me. You just say I prefer not to answer.

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

340 I prefer not to answer that --

THE COMMISSIONER:

That's okay.

345 MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

Right now.

THE COMMISSIONER:

350 Thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

355 (Translation) When the project was presented, introduced, did you have as a vision a project of two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) tons per year or was it - or did you know what region it was to serve in that initial project?

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

360 I had no idea. The letter that we received from the mayor was not on letterhead. It was not signed. It was not dated. It was mailed out to the rate payers simply saying that we needed to upgrade our dump, which we all took it that our trench landfill needed to be updated. And then, the truth - the scope of the project came to light, that it wasn't just our trench landfill that was going to be upgraded to fit environmental regulations, that we were looking for something that was going to house garbage for miles around.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

370 (Translation) I didn't understand the last part of your answer. You thought you would be

receiving waste from close to your municipality or from far away?

MS. CHARLENE SCHARF:

375 Just our municipality, we were under the understanding that it was just an upgrade to our trench landfill to make it comply with environmental regulations, no idea of the scope.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

380 (Translation) Thank you; Ms. Anne Cheng.

MS. ANNE CHENG:

385 (Translation) Good day, dear Chairman; so, you know my name, Anne Cheng. I'm President of Sphynx Corporation Inc., and I bought two hundred (200) acres in Danford about eight (8) kilometres from the proposed disposal site, where I was planning to create a camping ground. And I conducted my own research, and I came to an information session that you organized, and here's my opinion on the proposed project.

390 Given Mr. Rouleau, the person who is in charge of the project, said he had fifty percent (50%) - there was fifty percent (50%) of the Danford community that was supporting his project, unfortunately, the coalition of Danford Lake has, in its possession, the amount of people that signed a petition against the proposed disposal site, and they have a clear majority of people that are against it. The exact details will be provided to you later by the President.

395 Also, there are a hundred eighty-nine (189) letters that were written and sent to the Minister to ask for a public hearing, for a BAPE, and ninety percent (90%) were opposed to the proposed project.

400 So, I think that the information provided by Mr. Rouleau don't seem to be based on facts. I think that the best way to see the truth is to hold a referendum on the project.

405 And given the project promised between twenty-two (22) and thirty-seven (37) full-time jobs in the paper he inserted in the local paper, well, now, this figure came down to between four (4) and six (6) full-time jobs. So, it's clear that there is major inconsistencies here, especially for a project that hasn't even started yet. This also demonstrates that employment creation is not high on the priority list for the promoter.

410 Given the promoter said there would only be an increase of eight percent (8%) in traffic on the roads, eight percent (8%) increase in truck transportation, afterwards that was corrected by yourself, Mr. Commissioner, that there was currently - there would be a seventy-five percent

(75%) increase of truck traffic. I think that's what was said at the information session.

415 Therefore, I have good reason to doubt the information provided by the promoter, especially in terms of statistics. It's easy to understand that one may make a mistake, a slight mistake, a few percentage marks, but there's quite a difference between eight percent (8%) and seventy-five percent (75%). Even my son could tell you that.

420 Given the surveillance committee that was created last year before it was even supposed to come into existence, one of the personal friends of the promoter was a member of that committee. And I spoke to that person personally, and he clearly told me that he was in favour of the project. So, I consider this to be evidence that the promoter will not necessarily follow the rules that are - will be enacted by the government in the future. And this brings me to question the efficiency of a surveillance committee, if there are members that are in favour of the project.

425 I would like to thank the promoter for having submitted his resumé to the public and to have posted it on the BAPE web site upon my request, because I have no idea of what experience he had. He had never mentioned that in his promotional material.

430 So, unfortunately, to conclude, I'm not convinced that Mr. Rouleau will not sell the site, once all the approvals have been obtained. It often happens that you have waste sites that are sold or purchased, because there's a lot of money to be made. A company could buy the disposal site, once the project is approved, and may have no intention to maintain promises that were made by Mr. Rouleau or the promoter. And only - you don't have to follow few rules, government rules, to manage that site.

435 So, to conclude, I have no confidence in the capacity of the promoter to maintain his promises in the future, and I'm strongly opposed to the idea that this company be in charge of such an important site.

440 As for the disposal site, it's clear Danford Lake is an inappropriate site for such a project. Its area is full of wildlife. The proposed site is close to wetlands and the rivers Picanoc, Kazabazua, that come into the Ottawa River, which could lead to a future major disaster, if the membranes would perforate. We also admitted publicly, openly, during the information sessions that the membranes could rip eventually. Therefore, it doesn't remain - it's not only a possibility. It's more a probability.

445 Any amount of chemical product, even if it is processed, still contains toxic matter that ends up in the water. This destroys microorganisms. I'm not a biologist. However, it's pretty easy to understand. You can consider my opinion, if you wish. However, this could eventually destroy all the life in the Picanoc River and in other rivers flowing by there, including the Gatineau River, the Ottawa River.

455 This disposal site will attract mice, rats, and surely some disease that will have for a result
to poison the environment, poison the animals that will be eaten by other animals, and spread
everywhere throughout the animal world. Bird life also can carry disease over large distances,
great distances.

460 And we don't really know how much pollution will be needed to destroy the environment in
Danford, but it seems to me that an amount such as eight (8) million metric tons could surely do
the job, even if there are no major leaks. All part of an ecosystem are interrelated. Therefore,
anything you put in the soil that goes in water, it goes up in the air. And human beings are also
linked to the food chain. Therefore, their safety is put - is at high risk.

465 As for the level of reliability of the promoter, the potential of the environmental impact, the
fact that the majority of the residents, the taxpayers, are opposed to the project, and the potential
of danger to public health, for all these reasons, I think it's irrational to approve such a project.

470 There are other solutions instead of just burying waste. In Toronto, for example,
currently, not only all homes recycle paper, plastic, steel, and glass, but they also are
composting. There are four (4) different containers that are brought to the curb of the road every
week. Also, disposable diapers they use in the compost. I don't know how they do it, but they
use it in the compost in Toronto. So, if a city the size of Toronto could do that, well, Gatineau can
surely learn a trick or two (2).

475 In Ottawa also, there's a project, a composting project. It's a pilot project, which will be
only implemented next year in 2008, when all wastes, biodegradable wastes - I don't know if they
use the diapers for composting, but all meat, bones, vegetable waste will be composted. And at
the Trail Road landfill, they sell compost to the public. So, they make compost and then sell it
480 back to the public. So, that's a way of making money for the municipalities. It's not only a
question of expenses.

485 All these initiatives are in place now. There are also technologies that may eliminate
completely the need to have a disposal site, for example, gasification of plasma, which currently
is undergoing a pilot project at the Trail Road land site in Ottawa. And there's also incineration
managed by Eco Waste, incinerators that were verified by Environment Canada that produce very
little emissions.

490 So, these are long-term solutions that exist now. If Ontario can do it, why not us in
Quebec? If we want Quebec to remain *la belle province*, well, we'll have to surely make sure we
make steps to preserve it for the future. We have the solutions. All we need to do is use them.

Why create a problem we'll have to - our children will have to solve? We do not need to

495 give our waste as a heritage to our children. We can do them a favour of assuming our
responsibilities for our waste ourselves. Thank you, and there's a part I'd like my son to read.
He's not very comfortable in French. So, he'll read in English.

MR. LEE RECK:

500 (Presentation of brief)

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

505 (Translation) So, I would like you to introduce yourself now, please. Could you start over
again?

MR. LEE RECK:

510 (Presentation of brief)

THE COMMISSIONER:

515 (Translation) Mrs. Cheng, you said that you acquired two hundred (200) acre piece of
land. Are you residing there?

MS. ANNE CHENG:

520 (Translation) Actually, we are in the process of creating a building over there for a
residence.

THE COMMISSIONER:

525 (Translation) But the land that you have, it was to create a camping ground. How far is it
from the site?

MS. ANNE CHENG:

(Translation) About eight (8) kilometres.

530 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) So, you're not concerned of the impact of the site for your own grounds. It's
just sort of social and environmental interest.

535 MS. ANNE CHENG:

(Translation) The reason why I believe that I would be affected, and I think everyone in the region will be affected, too, because when I said that, for example, that wildlife, wild animals, they go everywhere in the woods. They don't remain in one place. And the birds, they can fly
540 many kilometres at one time. So, if they're ill or sick, they will spread all these diseases.

And everything we're going to find in the water and in the land, and everything will go in the land and in the air. And from the water, it goes in the air, and the air goes everywhere. We can't stop the wind from blowing. It blows everywhere. And if there's wind contained, and it's
545 drops of water with chemical products like in acid rain, we've seen these problems before. And so, the acid rains exist.

So, there will be products then in the water that can contaminate all kinds of spaces, and even if especially there's a big leakage or an accident, for example, that happens or that occurs,
550 and let's say if it goes into the Picanoc River, and the Picanoc River joins eventually the Gatineau River, and the Gatineau River goes to Ottawa. So, all this poison, all these poisons will just circulate to the whole region throughout the rivers.

And so, it's not only for myself. Yes, I see the economical aspect of my land will be
555 lowered drastically, if there's a big landfill site. People might not be as interested in coming camping, and especially if I could tell them, yes, you can go in canoe, do some canoeing in the Picanoc River, because it's so clean you can see right to the bottom. Now, it's no longer a tourist site. I don't know if people would even want to come.

560 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) We will have no other questions.

565 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Because of the Picanoc River, is your land close to the Picanoc River?

MS. ANNE CHENG:

(Translation) No, it's not on it, but, for me, it doesn't mean that because the water - the
570 water, Kazabazua is the Algonquin word which means that's the hidden river. So, the river runs under. So, we don't know exactly where it is, and we don't know where the water meet, and the waterways meet. And so, everything is interconnected.

575 So, and at the same time, I understand that - and the big problem is how we should

manage our waste. I know it has to go someplace else, but it seems to me that the potential problem, because of the situation - the ground is very sandy, and there's so much water all around that comes into the Gatineau River. So, it's not a very good site for such a landfill site. So, I think everyone should manage their own waste. That's what I think personally.

580

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, thank you, sir, and Mrs. Cheng; so, the spokesperson for the Valley of Gatineau and the prefect, Pierre Rondeau, with Mr. Réjean Carle and Mrs. Catherine Lussier.

585

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) Thank you for listening to our presentation; the Mayor of Bouchette and the President of the Sanitary Department, Mrs. Lussier is an engineer for our MRC, and Pierre Rondeau, the prefect of the MRC. Welcome to our region.

590

We are limited in time, but our MRC is in the north of the administrative region of Outaouais, and it spreads over thirty thousand five hundred and ninety-four (30,594) square kilometres. Low is one of the farther south in the region. So, roads - so, Autoroutes 117, 301, 105 give us access to the area. A total of twenty thousand five hundred and eighteen (20,518) citizens reside in seventeen (17) municipalities. Five (5) territories non-organized and two (2) Algonquin communities are on our territory.

595

Three (3) of the municipalities, Cayamant, Kazabazua, and Low, share the borders with the municipality of Allevin-and-Cawood situated in the MRC of Pontiac. The municipality of Kazabazua and of Low are directly localized on the road that the trucks would use to bring the waste on this project.

600

The MRC of the Valley of Gatineau is giving a follow-up to this participation to the first part of the hearing concerning this project for a landfill site in Danford Lake, and by presenting this brief and describing its position regarding this issue.

605

The territory of MRC Vallée-de-la-Gatineau counts a dozen of disposal trenches in a LET that is managed by local municipalities. The implementation of this rule concerning landfill and incineration of residual matter announces the closure of all these areas of elimination before January, 2009.

610

Amongst our direction for the PGMR of the MRC that came into effect on the 26th of October, let's look at the wish to discourage the creation of a mega LET regionally on our territory on the one of another MRC of the region of Outaouais by putting forward solutions that are more sustainable, such as the tri-composting and the gasification that will allow to minimize

615

or prevent the recourse to landfill.

620 The motivation of the MRC of the Valley of Gatineau wanting essentially to reach the
objective for the policy of management of the residual waste 1998-2008, while maintaining two (2)
avenues of the collection of waste, that's important for us. In fact, the implementation of a third
avenue for collecting putrefied matters would involve cost as much for the citizen and for the
environment, and the costs that are attached to the collection and transportation that we're not
ready to assume.

625 After the implementation in 2005 of the management system, integrated management
system, for silt of the septic system including the systematic collection of all the silts of the septic
tanks generated on the territory, more than thirteen thousand (13,000) square metres per year,
and the construction and an operation of the state of the art of a treatment centre, the MRC of the
630 Valley of Gatineau is trying to preserve its role in terms of anticipating and taking care of the
preservation of the environment, and putting some innovative solutions for the management of
these residual matters.

635 The production of ethanol starting from residual matters that originate from the domestic
area and also from the forest would be an excellent manner to recycle biomass, while
compensating for the economic challenge that the region is faced with.

640 Let's say, however, that the Canadian government has announced this year its intention
to demand that, starting 2010, all the fuels be made up from at least five percent (5%) of
renewable fuel. And this priority from the government is also supported by the energy strategy of
Quebec 2006-2015 that will propose a similar measure, and will stipulate that we need to
maximize the use from the forest industry and the farming and also urban waste. And this will be
encouraged rather than the use of corn and grain, even though it's technologically difficult,
environmentally and economically more viable for Quebec.

645 Believing that the management of these residual matter must be made in the context of
sustainable development by following a model that's in line with the direction of PGMR, the MRC
of the Valley is pursuing its effort in view of implementing a technology alternative that will eliminate
ultimate waste, and a table of the mayors is supporting these efforts.

650 The 20th of November, the table of the prefects of Outaouais mandated a working group
to analyze the variables related to the extent of these territories of the MRC, and the cost of
transportation, and the research in critical mass of residual matters, and the technological choice.
And the committee ad hoc created met seven (7) times between the 29th of November and the
655 6th of March, and there's a preliminary report that will be presented at the table of the prefects.
During this - this was presented on the 14th of March.

During this plenary committee on the 15th of May, the town of Gatineau recognized that

660 a table of the prefects of Outaouais constituted a regional forum to discuss the matters of regionalization and the management of residual matters. It formulated several recommendations, which is to ask each prefect to submit a list of the different files for which it is ready to consider a regionalization, and to adopt an action plan for three (3) years for the treatment of the different files that will have been retained in view of regionalizing the management of these wastes.

665 Let's mention that the Ville of Gatineau formulate a recommendation that aims to confirm that the city has five (5) files in view of eventual regionalization, and one of those would be the analysis of the best solution to eliminate the ultimate waste. In that text, we had a meeting yesterday, and I will mention it at the end. It was very good, so we'll talk about it. So, I will end with that.

670 So, the MRC of the Valley of Gatineau is not against the "securization" of these sites, but we believe that the organic matters at the origins of environmental nuisances, biogas and leachate, should not find their way in the stockage area in - that we call a commonly discharge or landfill site and also elimination site.

675 In fact, to hide our waste is just putting the bill to the future generation, which is inadmissible, given the technology - the alternative technologies that are available. However, we believe that it's imperative to consider all the residual matters to manage and not only to work in a silo and not consider the ultimate waste.

680 Like all the MRC's in Quebec, our MRC must implement measures that will aim to reach the objective of the Quebec policy to manage residual matters, and one of these objectives, the most ambitious one, is to maximize sixty percent (60%) of these putrefied matters.

685 For economic and environmental reasons related to transportation, we encourage implementation of technologies that will allow us to avoid the recourse to collection on three (3) fronts. These technologies will allow the minimization or will prevent the recourse to elimination. The study of implementation of this technology is part of the work of the regionalization of these files and the management of these residual matters in the region at this time and to our table of the
690 prefects.

695 Let's say also that the municipalities encourage the public management of residual matters, but it is - it goes without saying that the eventual opening of a LET will not guarantee that these ultimate wastes of the MRC will be sent, because part of the MRC is looking for a solution that corresponds better to its orientation, and, in another part, the municipalities would like to proceed according to the law and by the demands or bids.

Consequently, given the work that we have done with the MRC and we've done in

700 Outaouais, the City of Gatineau, the MRC of the Valley of Gatineau, cannot support this project in Danford Lake and in the municipality of Allevyn-and-Cawood.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

705 (Translation) So, we would really like to have - to hear about your meeting of yesterday. We're anxious to hear.

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

710 (Translation) There were some representatives from the MRC of Outaouais and the Mayor of Gatineau. There's a resolution from the city that was accepted and - or adopted. In the municipal, we need to respect certain delays. So, we have a council meeting of mayors in June, at the end of June, and we were looking for a sort of a possibility of waiting and the site that we - that is to come about.

715 We're looking for a possible delay, and there are people who want to renew their contracts in Gatineau for 2008-2015. We would be part of the bids that are going to take place for the transition of 2008-2013. And in the meantime, we would look for a possible solution for all of Outaouais, and we're looking at about two hundred (200,000), two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) tons with a sustainable environmental solution for all of the Outaouais region.

720

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

725 (Translation) Would you specify for us when you say you're looking for a possible solution, like a short-term solution, who are the people?

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

730 (Translation) The MRC Papineau is committed with Lachute. They're almost partners. Even if there is a change of ownership, they have more links with Lachute. Gatineau is really a client to the Lachute. And the Collines as well is like a client. We share the site. So, the MRC of Gatineau and MRC of Des Collines are practically partners. And in Pontiac, they didn't say no to the demand, and they have to wait.

735 So, in a common process, the Vallée-de-la-Gatineau, Gatineau, and Des Collines, we're going to have a common pursuit or common process. I won't say what they're going to say, because they will be meeting you tomorrow, but we want to know where they're going to go.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

740 (Translation) When are you going to make a decision? During the summer?

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) No, it's not going to happen that quickly. We --

745

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) No, but for the short term.

750

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) So, it's going - there's going to be some bids made in August, September for about fifteen (15) yearly tons. We're going to be involved in maybe in the next three (3) years. And during that time, we're going to look for an alternative for our region.

755

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) We're almost - we're close to half the year 2007. The incineration and the landfill or elimination of these residual matters, there's an agreement that will end in 2009. You're talking about a common agreement. Time is running out, and we're almost at the end of - well, we're meeting the end. And Pontiac says they're at the end also of their agreement, and they have to come to a solution. Why don't we have a solution that has been proposed yet?

760

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

765

(Translation) Outaouais has always been a bit different in their decision other than the twenty-five (25) and thirty (30) municipalities that have trenches. So, we are very particular in that respect, and I think we're becoming aware that we're going to have to have integrated management and a respectful management of the environment. It's a question of sustainability. We can't continue this way, and I don't think that the government will accept it, because we only have three hundred thousand (300,000) citizens with the territory that we have.

770

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You're talking about a volume, two hundred (200,000) to two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) yearly, tons yearly, that will be managed regionally. Does that include the residual matters of the industries, of the businesses, or of construction?

775

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

780

(Translation) We're not in the city here. So, we have to consider that. Other than Gatineau, I can't answer for the MRC's, but, for us, the business and the institutions and the

785 residents, it's the same pattern. It's not viable economically to work on two (2) fronts. Like most of the businesses is recovering and about a hundred percent (100%), but, the businesses and the institutions, they go in the residual matters with the residences.

THE COMMISSIONER:

790 (Translation) You mentioned the amount of two hundred (200,000), two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) tons.

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

795 (Translation) It's in respect with the population of Outaouais. It's the problem - this is the amount generated. So, it's just like what's going to be generated and not differentiate the category.

THE COMMISSIONER:

800 (Translation) When you're talking about favouring the best maximization, whether it's composting or - do you have one technology that you would choose? I know Mrs. Lussier is very concerned on the choice of technology. Maybe you have your own opinion. Does that include thermal pleo plasma technique?

805 MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) So, the technology that eliminates our waste like dry composting, gasification, that could produce some energy as well is surely above a landfill site in the long-term run.

810 THE COMMISSIONER:

815 (Translation) You were talking about maximization that would make it so that the landfill site, ultimate landfill site, would not be necessary. Is that what I heard from you, that these - that the waste would be reduced?

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

820 (Translation) If we're talking tri-composting and we're talking about gasification, the residue of this is not a waste. It's an energy that can be reused and the composting the same thing. So, the data is there to give you a better answer, maybe Mme. Lussier - so, gasification is a product that could be used to make asphalt or something else, tri-composting, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

825

(Translation) It's not part of the ultimate waste. So, you can't have a hundred percent (100%) elimination of these waste that would be otherwise directed to this landfill site. What is the minimum that you are aiming for in terms of residual matter that could go to an ultimate waste landfill site? I'm talking about globally.

830

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) I'm talking about five percent (5%), gasification, about five percent (5%).

835

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

(Translation) If you allow me, the process of gasification are different. We have four (4) or five (5) promoters that offer five (5) or six (6) different technologies. For some, we have a byproduct that is vitrified that could be used as - like filling on a site, or they could have other sub-products that could be used for other uses.

840

We have also other process that can be - that could be buried, but they could be done in a different way. So, and the volume of these would be minimal, but there will be some left. We can't just get energy from all the waste.

845

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) But what's that percentage, I want to know?

850

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

(Translation) I can't give you - Mr. Prefect said five (5) percent. I would have difficulty to say something else, because the technologies are giving - are proposing different technologies. They're all different. So, we're talking maybe - tri-composting, maybe twenty (20), twenty-five percent (25%).

855

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And if the technology of tri-composting was chosen, would you see the necessity at that point like a LET in the region, if it was the choice?

860

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) Twenty (20), twenty-five (25) of two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) tons, it would be fifty thousand (50,000). I don't know if it's economically viable to operate a site

865

for that amount.

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

870 (Translation) Yes, we're not opposed to burying certain things in a safe way, but there
could be some measures put in place beforehand. And if we're talking about tri-composting, all
the waste that come back from this process, they are inert, and they're for the "securization" of
getting all these biogases. And we believe that the Quebec government wants to make these sites
safe, but with the process of tri-composting, it's much less hazardous than what we put in our
875 green bags right now.

THE COMMISSIONER:

880 (Translation) You're encouraging the public management of the residual matters. What are
the advantages or disadvantages of public management rather than a private management?

MR. REJEAN CARLE:

885 (Translation) At the beginning of the project, the promoter had asked Mr. Prefect and me
to meet us. We had seen two (2) positive aspects in the sense that he was saying that the local
population was in favour. And at that time, I don't remember whether it's three (3) or four (4)
years, we didn't - we knew very little of the alternatives that existed. So, the technical landfill was
better than the trenches. So, we thought it was a progress, but things have evolved a lot in the
last few years, and now we know better.

890 And there was a negative aspect that we had mentioned to the promoter. It was a problem
that came from a private business. So, that's why we felt that it was public management that
would be a best - the best way to go. So, it was our preference, and we could really debate that
for a long time, but a sector that is - has many problems. The common opinion wishes for a public
895 organization to manage it. We're not talking about transportation, but just the final management
which would be preferable. So, I think rigorous aspect is more important than the concern for
profits.

THE COMMISSIONER:

900 (Translation) Even though it would cost a bit more.

MR. REJEAN CARLE:

905 (Translation) Yes, I don't know if it cost more right now in comparison. We have
neighbours, not to name them, not those who are concerned here, who are offering a LET at

910 one hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000.00) a ton. In a private business that I met in Ottawa offers management that is completed thermal for seventy dollars (\$70.00) a ton. So, there's a possible comparison to be made here, but I don't see that public management would automatically cost more than a private management.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

915 (Translation) And the fact that it will be a promoter, a private promoter, that will propose to implement something that is on the state's land, would that be a problem?

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

920 (Translation) I think it's the guarantees. It would all be in the contract and the responsibility, but something of such an importance is imperative for a local municipality, the collection and the transportation of the waste. And all of the municipalities are in contracts with private businesses, but the site belongs to the MRC. And then, it will not penalize one MRC. If Outaouais was there, we're talking about seventy-two (72) municipalities. So, in terms of management, it could be inter - in partnership, inter-management of the MRC's. I've always
925 thought it would be a better way to go.

THE COMMISSIONER:

930 (Translation) Just to make it clearer, clearer for me at least, the collection of waste, residential waste, which is - it's part of the - it's local responsibility to collect. Is it the same for the residual matters of the institutions and businesses?

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

935 (Translation) In the municipalities of the MRC in Gatineau, the biggest town is Maniwaki. It's forty-two hundred (4,200) population. There's no difference between the three (3). It's the same contractor that collects the three (3). We don't have the critical mass to have separate contracts. The only one - the only place that is different, it's the big industries in like forest industry, like our sawmills and our wood plants. And so, all the collection of the residual matters
940 on all the municipalities, residential, business, or institutional, there's no - there's not enough volume to really separate it. So, it's all together.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

945 (Translation) In several briefs, the people talk of the importance of managing the residual matters and to treat them near the mass centres to avoid transporting them on long distances. How do you see it? Since you have a very large territory in Outaouais, and a big portion is in an area that's close to Hull, about seventy-five percent (75%) I would say that are close and around

Hull, and there are zones that are farther than that, but how could it be managed?

950

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) Ideally, the least transportation possible, and would there be a fair equation or for per residents, per the number of homes, but to shorten the transportation for the critical mass, which is the largest, which is Gatineau, but it would all depend on the technology that we're going to use.

955

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, there could be some technologies that would be spread out to the territory.

960

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) Some might be more urban or those who are closest to the urban centres like a land site, as we are expecting to see, I don't think the *capitale nationale* will allow us to put it in the Gatineau Park.

965

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Mme. Lussier.

970

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

(Translation) I just wanted to add, because he's talking a per equation. For our septic tanks or systems, that's what we have put in place. So, all the municipalities that are close to the centre, if we're looking at the transportation, and the ones who are farther, that aspect was brought to the ad hoc committee in management of residual matters in Outaouais, of course. And it was the professionals who were there. It was not the elected members who were there, but it's an idea that's circulating. In the case of the technology, it should be placed closest to where the mass is. So, the working committee would make sure that the municipalities would find it advantageous to really adhere to this principle.

975

980

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Would there be an advantage to reduce also the transportation for those who are farther from the mass centre?

985

MS. CATHERINE LUSSIER:

(Translation) I know there's a promoter, like Mr. Francis mentioned, that he talked about

990

995 a treatment centre near the city and a smaller one that would be a bit further. I don't have the data here to say that it's feasible. However, we're talking about the quantity or the numbers of trucks that are going to be travelling by. And given that there are less transportation, the CO or the green gas effects would be - not be as voluminous.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1000 (Translation) So, you made a plan in managing the residual matters in saying that you are not encouraging the implementation of a LET. How can - that declaration or this statement, was it received unanimously or was it the major part of the mayor's?

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

1005 (Translation) It has not been adopted the first night, but at the last version that we presented, it was unanimously received or adopted and was approved by Mr. Mulcair which was there at the time. So, it's an official document, and it was admitted by all the members.

1010 In this process, although we are proposing, we looked at other technologies, and the people in these fields, in this field, they went to Sorel, Tracy, and Sherbrooke to look at ways and technologies that exist elsewhere. So, we are very aware. We didn't know - we just didn't read about it. We went in to look at it directly.

1015 The LET, which is the landfill site, no matter what the type, the regulation is made today, and I remember the dump site that used to exist and the trenches, residual trenches, and this is a site that's going to be there for twenty (20) years. We don't know what kind of waste we're going to produce. That's what's more of a concern. So, to hide that from our children by burying that is not right. I think, in 2007, we can do better than that.

1020 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1025 (Translation) So, what kind of an authorization request can we ask? Because the management plans are about five (5) years long, and, in five (5) years, you have the possibility to review all the management plan, and you have to do it with your population. How are you going to handle this?

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

1030 (Translation) It's the law that allows that. With the promoters, we could ask the same thing. If I was a promoter, I could do the same thing.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) As a manager myself, if I'm talking about an MRC...

1035

MR. PIERRE RONDEAU:

(Translation) I wouldn't give an authorization certificate for that length of time.

1040

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) So, we're going to take a fifteen (15) minute break. Thank you for your testimony.

1045

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1050

(Translation) I'd like to invite Eric Frigeault, please. Is Mr. Frigeault in the room? Good evening.

MR. ERIC FRIGEULT:

1055

(Translation) I recently arrived in the region. I'm not exactly in this municipality. I am in the region of Wakefield, but I spent all my life in the Lachute region. So, for the commission and for the people of the region, I'd like to share some experiences that I've gone through during my life, especially in the last few years.

1060

Last year, the site became private, and I have a friend that has a biological vegetable farm that's located seven (7) kilometres from the proposed site.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1065

(Translation) The site you're talking about is the one of Lachute?

MR. ERIC FRIGEULT:

1070

(Translation) Yes, the waste disposal site in Lachute, that's the one I'm talking about. So, this is a good friend. And since last year, he noticed a major difference when the winds come towards his property. He lost a lot of crops, and maybe he'll have to close soon.

1075

I know that many farmers in the Mirabel region around the Lachute disposal site also have land that cannot be used now for agriculture. There are phreatic water tables that were affected. It's a large block of clay that is affected here. And we're told in Lachute that there's no leaks possible, because the clay retains liquids very well.

1080 And that frightens me for this region here. Like a few mentioned before me, the type of membranes - I'm not really a specialist - if they're perforated, these membranes, you have sandy soil there close to rivers. It's very dangerous, and I think that's looking for trouble, this project in terms of the environment, the rivers, and the ecosystem.

1085 There are many prefects, mayors, that came to speak, and I understand the economic considerations that MRC's have to face, but I wonder, the river, how much is it worth? How much is an ecosystem worth? Therefore, as I mentioned, I understand. It's hard to make a judgement. I know it's not easy to be a mayor. Sometimes small communities have to assume many responsibilities, but we really have to consider our future, our children.

1090 Just to come back onto where I live, Lachute, currently we greet twenty percent (20%) of Quebec's waste. And for those that are interested, I get my figures from SOS Déchets, which is a commission that was created in 2002 following an extension request for the landfill site at Lachute, a sixty-five (65) hectare extension.

1095 I know there was a BAPE hearing in Lachute. I don't know if it was you, but the BAPE had made sixty-eight (68) recommendations at that time. And Minister Mulcair was responsible for the environment at that time. And there were sixty-eight (68) recommendations formulated, most of them against the project, and the project still went ahead and was approved by Mr. Mulcair. So, I hope that this time Ms. Beauchamps, well, based on recommendations, will consider all these recommendations.

1100 There's Ste. Sophie, Lachenaie, Lachute that represent three (3) technical landfill sites, well, together, a great fifty percent (50%) of the waste of the Province of Quebec.

1105 My father lives eight (8) kilometres from the Lachute site. When the winds are coming towards his house, he cannot dry his clothes outside. There's a kind of rotten egg smell in the air when the winds come towards Lachute. Of course, you can still live. You kind of get used to the odour with time, but I think every human has a right to a quality of life. And I don't wish this upon the people here.

1110 There are also factors here. I think we're talking about roads, the 301, Road 105. It's not too bad, because the repairs of these roads are distributed throughout Quebec taxpayers, given they're provincial roads, but, in Lachute, there's Highway 148 that is used a lot by the dump trucks, and that is also a provincial road. There's Highway 50 also that the dump trucks use a lot, but there's still a few streets, a few roads, around Lachute that are used by the dump trucks, and this is Lachute taxpayers that have to fix these roads.

1115 So, I don't know how things would happen here, but I imagine that it will be a small group of citizens that will pay for a lot of waste disposal of other Quebec residents.

1120 We have a policy, Quebec policy, for residual matter management. And the study should
be completed in 2008, and there's supposed to be implementation in 2009. So, I think,
throughout the general public, all those sitting here in the room, we have to question ourselves on
our future, on how we manage our waste. Yes, it may be a responsibility of a MRC, of a mayor,
of a province, but, in the end, we are the ones that are consuming these goods, and we produce
a lot of waste.

1125 So, I really wish that this policy - I don't know if it could be used as a recommendation, but
I would rather use this approach to manage waste, and have one locally maybe in every
municipality. I don't know how it works. I'm not a politician. I'm just a simple human being that is
concerned by the future.

1130 I also wanted to mention I experienced something some three (3) years ago. I went to get
clay, given the Lachute site is a big clay site. When they extend the site, they dig up, and I
studied - I wanted to use clay to use it in a technique, and I was on the site about forty-five (45)
minutes to fill up a trailer.

1135 I was truly surprised to see the amount of trucks, the amount of waste, in those forty-five
(45) minutes. It was a big mountain with huge trucks that were crushing the waste to better hide it,
but, you know, when not buried in our background, we have a tendency to think that they
disappear. Even I thought that in Lachute, but, finally, I became aware of the incredible amount
of waste that was sent to that site.

1140 I didn't spend many days to see if it was constantly that way, if it was repetitive, but I was
told there was at least a hundred (100) big dump trucks daily that go to the Lachute site. They
come from Gatineau, from Mont Laurier. There are many municipalities that dump their waste in
our municipality. And I don't wish that upon anyone.

1145 So, if I'm here, it's to oppose the project. I think they comprise risks that are not worth
taking. We have technologies. And as I said in the beginning, I understand the mayors. It's not
an economic - it's not an easy economic decision to make. However, the government says
everywhere publicly that the government has a sustainable development approach.

1150 If the municipalities really have trouble making decisions that are a little more costly, I think
it would be worthwhile. I, as a citizen, would be willing to pay to contribute to a better waste
management program, because, in my mind, the ecosystem is priceless. And decontaminating a
river, I don't think any municipality can afford that.

1155 And I truly believe I've covered all the elements of my presentation today, but I can confirm
the fears of many people that spoke today, among others, the vehicles.

1160 Oh, yes, I wanted to mention that there are people that experience thyroid gland

problems in the Mirabel area, where there was a leak and a contamination of the sub-waters. There are people that have serious health problems, vomiting. So, we have to constantly listen to the radio to see when they can drink the water, when they have to boil it. So, it's not an easy situation.

1165

I talk as a resident of Lachute, because I've lived there all my life. I just moved over here, and I didn't really count on or consider leaving Lachute and end up with the same problem, especially this far away. So, there you go. That's what I had to say.

1170

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Yes, you didn't talk to us about seagulls. Are there any problems with them?

1175

MR. ERIC FRIGEAULT:

(Translation) Well, experience, when I went to collect clay, well, I put a cap on. I had to wear a cap. So, they're truly located where - there are many of them there at that site. Mr. Mulcair, in 2003, approved the sixty-five (65) hectare extension. So, this additional sixty-five (65) hectares was used, and they destroyed very good farmland, farm grounds there, some of the best in the Province of Quebec.

1180

And by the way, Naya, the water company, uses water from Lachute to fill up its bottles. So, I'm sure Naya are making - conducting tests. They won't take any risks, but the sub-water is not too far from their dump site.

1185

So, seagulls, yes, there's a major problem, but it's really located over the site.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1190

(Translation) But they fly.

MR. ERIC FRIGEAULT:

(Translation) Oh, yeah, they fly, but it's the people working on the site that have problems with them. It's not really people - surrounding residents. They're more concerned with the smell. And on the 148 between Mirabel and Lachute, people that live on that road, there were emissions in 2001 on a TV show. A cameraman was filming, and we could see a garbage truck go by every two (2) minutes, and they're not driving slowly. They're really going for it.

1195

1200

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You're here as a citizen, or are you a member of a coalition or a group?

MR. ERIC FRIGEAULT:

1205

(Translation) No, I'm here as a human being. And when I found out there was a hearing - I have a friend that is not part of the coalition, but who attended the first hearings and spoke about this. And I didn't hesitate one minute. I called. I wanted to register just to come, because sometimes you may have fears. People may fear the increase in traffic, the environment. I lived

1210

in Lachute and experienced this type of project. So, I thought it was important to come and tell you, share my experience.

Whether it's a technical landfill or sanitation, it's for the middle ages. There's so many technologies available, new technology, I don't understand, but what I hear is that it's economic reasons that prevent us from using them. I hope Ms. Beauchamps will be inclined towards sustainable development approaches and help the MRC's, the municipalities, better manage waste.

1215

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1220

(Translation) Thank you for your presentation; Denise Renaud Larocque, please.

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

1225

(Translation) Good evening, first of all, I'd like to thank the BAPE to allow me to voice my opinion on the possibility of implantation of this project in Danford Lake. I submitted a personal brief in which I talk about the short experience I had as a member of the environmental committee called watchdog committee in Danford Lake.

1230

In the last sixteen (16) months, I've gathered information on the management of residual matters to understand the complex file in which I got involved with. I come out of it much more informed of the issues and convinced more that Danford Lake should not become a regional dump site in the next thirty (30) years.

1235

I'm sure that, all along these hearings, you'll understand the attachment we all have for this piece of province we call God's country.

1240

So, we know, in this situation, we'll have to be vigilant, but we must choose a way - but we must concert - broadcast information, especially when we set up a committee that's supposed to represent the public and its opinion. We expect that our officials keep us informed, that our opinions are heard as much for the major city taxpayers as the rural municipality taxpayers, when it's time to decide on a major issue like the one we're before right now.

In all this file, nothing happened this way. We're not concerned with the worries of

1245 citizens. We choose confrontation instead of conciliation, a village divided by the lack of clarity and relevant information in a file that could change our lifestyle forever.

My deepest desire is that when the hearings will end, taxpayers of Danford Lake and all the people that worked on this file will regain trust in a system that cheated them in the last few
1250 years. Let's hope their involvement will make the difference between an imposed project versus a clear project and with respect to the objectives that the municipality set for its citizens.

And I hope that the decision made by Minister Beauchamps will be taken after in-depth study of all the facts, and that the decision will have an impact in the region orientation plan of
1255 management of residual matter in the Outaouais Valley, thank you.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you; we heard a lot of people tonight, but in the briefs that we're going
1260 to hear during the next few days, we're going to hear about the difficulty, and we'll hear about the confrontation of those who are in favour and those who are against. Do you think that it's possible to understand one another, so that social peace can come back?

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

(Translation) A reconciliation is always possible, but up until three (3) days ago, when the
1265 mayor decided to have a special meeting, so that the municipality would adopt a resolution unanimously for the project, which was protested against by some citizens, especially one of the councillors and a citizen which is a councillor at the city.

And like when it started four (4) or five (5) years ago, the only way that I see to answer
1270 what happened then and to answer the citizen is to have the right and to have a vote that will be held, so that all the arguments stop, because some people think they're right, and other people say you're wrong, so, for as long as the people won't have voted on something. And we have
1275 been told so many times, I'm really upset. And I've left the city to come here about thirty (30) years ago, and to have to go through this is very upsetting.

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You participated in the surveillance committee. Is it on your own initiative, or
1280 did someone invite you?

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

(Translation) It is following some information that was going through the village that there
1285

would be a committee following a request from the government by the update of our presentation. I went. There was a few people from the village. There was - Mr. Rouleau was there. I was interested, and just like any good old citizen, I thought the way we should manage our waste, it should - well, I think that it should be done and be up to date, but, so, anyway, I went a second time.

1290

And then, we put a committee in place, and there was so few people that we elected some people, a president, a secretary. And then I was asked to sit as a secretary, and I accepted. And I made a draft of a few minutes. And in the third or fourth meeting, there were rumours going around that Mr. Rouleau, the promoter, had met some citizens to offer them to buy their property that was very close to the proposed site.

1295

And so, when I asked the question to the promoter, I said is that true you're doing this, he said yes, but those are agreements that will only become valid if the project is adopted. And so - and it was going to be - the market value would be granted for the - and so, what about our properties that will be going down said some people. And he said, well, we can't buy the whole village. And so, I was annoyed of his answer.

1300

And then, the promoters came at another meeting, and he came with a consultant in communications. And because I had been interested in the file of the management of residual matters, and because I had heard about Cantley's dump, it's the same person that represented the owners and the people who represented the firm in D.C. that looked after the dump site in Cantley. So, I said that's not right, you know. So, I raised the issue. And so, I was sort of brushed off. They said everything is okay, but I had a very bitter taste from that.

1305

And when we asked questions, people from the community started to call me to ask me for information. I asked them to come to another meeting. And then, the communication stopped right there. We couldn't get any answers. The mayor was always say, oh, you're going to get answers. In a public hearing - we had public hearing - the answers never came. Then, we were told, no, it's not the place to get the answer. It's with the BAPE that's going to review the answers. That's the only place you're going to have a referendum.

1310

So, all this information, the more we went on, the more it was falsified. So, I resigned, because I found it ridiculous to have to deal with this sort of thing. Then, I joined the coalition. And then, I'm presenting here in my own personal name.

1315

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) What is the volume that is proposed and the size of this elimination site? If it was smaller, would that be more acceptable?

1325

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

1330 (Translation) At the beginning of the project, yes, in my resignation letter to the
committee, for the environmental committee, I also put a letter with my brief, and I talked about
this approach. I said, yeah, we have to find solution. We have to look after our own problem, but
to import these waste from Gatineau and the municipalities of two hundred thousand (200,000)
people and for other MRC's, and so I thought this is ridiculous. So, I thought, yeah, I could - we
could look after ourselves, if Pontiac looked after themselves. So, we looked after our own.

1335

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) So, this LET would be in Otter Lake.

1340

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

(Translation) This was my opinion at that time, but it's completely changed now, because
I've seen, because I've read, and I've noticed there's so many other ways to deal with our waste.
There are new technology, and we are beyond that solution.

1345

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) When you said that you - when you went to the first meeting, when you had
that meeting, the surveillance committee or the citizens committee...

1350

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

(Translation) It was supposed to be one for management, environmental management
committee. And once that - once the LET would be approved, that committee would be a
surveillance committee.

1355

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) But the beginning of this was a meeting to talk...

1360

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

(Translation) Of the project.

1365

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Because I had heard that it was to talk about the new - the actual LET.

1370 MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

(Translation) No, it was a project, as we understood it at the time. The majority of people understood what was to close the trenches, like the waste trenches, to have a technical landfill site, but not too many people thought that it's going to be a LET that was going to be for the whole region. I mean it is dimension that we didn't really consider at the time.

1375

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And the information was not given to you during the first meeting for the volume.

1380

MS. DENISE RENAUD LAROCQUE:

(Translation) Not at all, I've reread the letters. I looked at all the documentation. It might have been mentioned in a small way, but it was never with the size that it's being proposed now.

1385

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you for your testimony; Michèle Borchers, please.

1390

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) Mme. la Présidente, M. le Commissaire, Mrs. Chair, Mr. Commissioner, good evening, thank you for granting me this valuable speaking time, and thank you for BAPE, for your very existence.

1395

My name is Michèle Borchers. I emigrated here from Germany more than thirty (30) years ago. For the past twenty-five (25) years, I have been spending as much time as possible, both summer and winter, with my Kazabazua residence, two (2) kilometres from the village of Danford Lake.

1400

I am opposed to the project for several reasons, which I will mention here only briefly.

1405

My first reason is the unilateral approach adopted in the concept of the project. Oddly enough, both the municipality of Allevyn-and-Cawood and the MRC of Pontiac were already supporting this regional project back in 2004 without consulting the other MRC's and municipalities of the Outaouais.

1410

This unilateral approach is all the more surprising, since the other Outaouais MRC's never hid their coolness towards landfills, which they considered merely a method of storage.

The joint efforts that began last year among all the MRC's and the City of Gatineau highlighted the need to seek an alternative to landfill for the medium and long-term together.

1415 The Eastern Townships also came to these same conclusions. Composting and plasma gasification head the list of recommended options in their February, 2007 study, while landfill takes last place.

1420 So, true, the time limit of 19th of January, 2009, leaves only eighteen (18) months for regional officials to reach a decision, but if it's a question of only two (2) or three (3) years to find a non-polluting technology that would, moreover, supply some energy, then why not negotiate a brief delay with the government rather than mortgage the future of our home environment for generations to come?

1425 The second reason for my opposition for the project is its remoteness from the main source of waste. The proximity principle is a very common-sense principle for environmental, economic, security reasons.

1430 The main source of waste in the region is the City of Gatineau. It would be brilliant, as one regional official brilliantly remarked at these hearings, if the future regional site for turning waste into energy were located near Gatineau, somewhere between Gatineau and Wakefield, for example.

1435 My third reason in the proposed solution is its lack of social justice. There is something indecent in sacrificing a municipality of several hundred souls and a natural paradise to accommodate three hundred forty thousand (340,000) people who live elsewhere. Urban waste does not belong in the wilderness, but social justice also requires the burden to be shared fairly by everyone.

1440 Well, the citizens of Kazabazua have already done their part for the common good. They already have something in their backyard. In 2005, after negotiations with the MRC, we agreed to host a regional infrastructure and the increased truck traffic that came with it. And I am speaking of the septic waste treatment plant serving the entire MRC de la Vallée-de-la-Gatineau just over ten (10) kilometres from the proposed landfill.

1445 If it is true that no one wants an engineered landfill in their backyard, then isn't it high time to find a different method? It is not a question of knowing where to put our waste. It is a question of the best way to turn it into something useful, like energy.

1450 This leads me to my fourth reason for opposing the project: the technology chosen. For his project, the promoter had to ask the government to make an exception to the moratorium on establishing and expanding landfill sites. We can better understand why this moratorium existed, when we realize that the slightest break in the geo membrane system can be breached by toxic

agents from hazardous household waste, which is always part of the total waste of the burial.

1455 This must be the reason why, on June 1st, 2007, the regional director of the Quebec Department of Natural Resources wrote that it is in the Quebec government's interest to sell the land to the promoters, and I quote, "not keep public land that is likely to be contaminated at the end of the period of operation".

1460 At Berlin, in 2006, the German Green Party, probably the greenest that one can imagine, came out in favour of modern incineration as a waste-into-energy solution. They said that it made absolutely no sense to continue burying waste and storing up pollution for generations to come, since we now have technology that allows us to turn it into energy.

1465 Sweden has twenty-nine (29) plants incinerating forty-seven percent (47%) of all household waste and generating a total of nine point three (9.3) terrawatt hours of energy.

In November, 2006, the Government of Ontario initiated a comprehensive public consultation on innovative projects for producing energy from waste. The cities of Mississauga and
1470 Brampton in Ontario have installed up-to-date incinerators that produce up to nine (9) megawatts of electricity a year, enough electricity to light six thousand (6,000) homes.

And some Canadian cities have already opted for plasma gasification. This is true of the nearby City of Ottawa, but it is also true of the cities of Red Deer and Edmonton in Alberta. In fact,
1475 it is a Quebec company, Enerkem, that is doing the work in Edmonton. We were even surprised to hear at these hearings the promoter's chief engineer express his enthusiasm for one of the plasma gasification processes.

Quebec is a leader in many fields. Why not in waste management as well? So, one of
1480 our recommendations would be that the Quebec Department of the Environment be proactive and conduct research in waste-into-energy technology.

And my fifth reason is the risk of importing waste from Ontario. We now know that it is perfectly legal to import not only hazardous waste, recyclable, and compostable material, but
1485 also regular waste into Quebec on condition that the truck transporting it contains at least fifty percent (50%) recyclable waste.

Since it is impossible to monitor the border between Quebec and Ontario, it means that, for all practical purposes, the Outaouais region is in great danger of receiving waste imported from
1490 Ontario. And this is not paranoia on our part, since this particular danger was pointed out by a regional director of the Quebec Environment Department, who commented on the impact study.

And, finally, let us not forget that the principal shareholder in LDC is a recycling and

demolition company from Ontario.

1495

And my sixth reason: the lack of trust in the ability of the Department of Environment to enforce laws and regulations. The problem is not a lack of laws and regulations. The problem, as the Ministry's representative expressed it at these hearings, is that they are not obeyed. They do not respect the rules.

1500

Quebec's Auditor General agrees. And, according to him, the Department of the Environment lacks the resources necessary to monitor landfills adequately or to even punish the operators who are found guilty. Our friends from Cantley could certainly confirm this.

1505

Well, then, we think it is going too far to ask us to show trust in a system that is acknowledged to be deficient.

My final reason for opposing this project is also a lack of trust, but, this time, it is in regard to those who are promoting the project.

1510

The Supreme Court of Canada considers a municipality obligated to exercise its powers equitably or fairly, in good faith, and taking into account the public interest.

Well, then, how can citizens trust their municipal officials:

1515

- when their municipality's invitation to an initial public meeting made no mention of the project's regional scope, giving the impression that the project only involved replacing the old dump with a new one?

1520

- when their municipality authorized the promoter to submit his project to the government only two (2) weeks after that first public meeting, which was attended by - a mere fourteen (14) residents came?

1525

- when, month after month, the mayor and a majority of council members refused to listen to their request for a referendum, while leading citizens to believe that they will have an opportunity to say yes or no to the project at the BAPE hearings?

1530

- when their mayor stated before the media that the final decision rested with the people, then used his veto to prevent a referendum?

- when the mayor repeatedly declared that the municipality could not withdraw its support of the project without risking legal proceedings, while the promoter denies making threats in this regard?

1535

- when the municipality and the promoter exclude from public consultation seasonal

residents and the residents of neighbouring municipalities, yet claim to give their project a regional scope?

How can citizens trust the MRC Pontiac:

1540

- when the MRC Pontiac approved the project only five (5) weeks after that first public meeting without bothering to find out if the public supported it?

1545

- when, in June, 2005, the MRC Pontiac wrote to the City of Gatineau to promote a future engineered landfill site at Danford Lake which, officially, had not yet been chosen?

1550

- when, during a public consultation on the 12th of June, 2006, the MRC Pontiac heard the public overwhelmingly declare themselves against the choice of Danford Lake as a potential site for a regional landfill, but requested exactly the opposite from the government two (2) weeks later?

1555

How can citizens trust the promoter:

- when they learn that he wrote to the Mayor of Gatineau that he is supported by almost a hundred percent (100%) of the local population, while a majority of the people are opposed to the project?

1560

- when he said in his impact study that, in general, the organizations that he met with have given their support to the project, while the only ones he met - that he only met, in fact, with two (2) of the numerous organizations that use the region for recreational or touristic purposes?

1565

How can citizens trust the promoter:

- when they discover one day that the address of their web site has been closely copied in order to lure the reader to the promoter's web site?

1570

- when they learn that the two (2) companies responsible for the impact study, Teknika and Fondex, are acting as both judge and jury, since they would operate the proposed landfill site alongside LDC?

1575

- when they read in the June 7, 2007 edition of Le Droit that one of the Fondex chief engineers admitted to the Court a day earlier that the wells Fondex drilled on the Cantley dump

site do not comply with the Department of Environment's regulations, because, he claimed, engineers work to what they interpret as the spirit of the law and do not necessarily conform or comply to the letter of the law?

1580 Finally, how can citizens trust the Ministry of Municipal Affairs:

- when, in April, 2006, the municipality and the Department of Municipal Affairs dangled the possibility of a referendum before the community, but used laws and regulations during the summer to avoid the promised referendum?

1585

If citizens cannot trust those who want to establish an engineered landfill site even before the project begins, how could they possibly have any trust in them afterwards?

All of these points are repeated in a detailed fashion in the brief submitted to the BAPE.

1590

In the fall of 2006, the citizens of Allevyn-and-Cawood were forced to face facts. The two (2) levels of government in which they had put their trust and which were supposed to represent them and defend their interests had, as one Pontiac mayor put it, shut them out of the decision-making. This is not just our reading of events. It is that as well of several Pontiac mayors and journalists who have followed the events.

1595

The behaviour of the municipality of Allevyn-and-Cawood and of the MRC Pontiac in this matter raise serious questions regarding the power given to elected members.

1600

Yes, citizens understand quite well that their elected officials are there to represent them and, in their name, make decisions affecting the daily affairs of the municipalities. What they do not understand, however, is how three (3) levels of government can work together to prevent them from participating in making a long-term decision that involves the well-being and the future of their community.

1605

What we hope for is that, having listened to our arguments, the BAPE will invalidate the sham public consultation organized by the promoter and the municipal council of Allevyn-and-Cawood.

1610

And if, as came out during these hearings, the Ministry of the Environment attaches so little importance to the promoter's public consultation, then it should, at the very least, avoid creating expectations that cannot be fulfilled, because that produces enormous frustration and anger and disrupts the community's social fabric, the human community's social fabric.

1615

People aren't fools. They can tell the difference between something genuine and something fake.

1620 We would also hope that the BAPE will recommend that the concept of social acceptability be clarified by making a list of criteria to guide the public consultation process, criteria that are specific, objective, and clear. There is something perverse in letting these criteria be defined by the project's proponents.

1625 For all these reasons, we believe that the Danford Lake engineered landfill project should not be approved, and thank you for your attention.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1630 (Translation) In your brief, you're hoping for a better definition of the concept of social acceptability by establishment of criteria. Can you give us some ideas of these criteria?

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

1635 (Translation) I'm not a sociologist. I think it's something that should be done as a team, but it's clear that, right now, we are in total mist. It has not been defined. And now it's just arbitrary and the will of one municipality and a promoter, who is establishing these criterias.

1640 The promoter and the municipality have found in this present case that the seasonal citizens were not important, and that it's only the permanent residents, which is a strange way to look at their regional project.

So, I don't think that the Department of Environment should let these people act any which way. It should be a team that should establish these criteria.

1645 And the first thing that comes to mind, it's a referendum. It's obvious that the people don't understand why such an important decision can be anticipated without really asking them what they think about it through a referendum. And I think we've put the cart before the horse.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1650 (Translation) When we talk about a criteria, would fairness be - should it be a criteria, social fairness?

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

1655 (Translation) It should be part of this criteria. Like social equity or social fairness is something that's absolutely fundamental. We can't ask a small group of people to support the burden of a whole community, simply because you have to put something someplace.

In my opinion, the syndrome of not in my yard is - we can reverse that, because if it's a

1660 syndrome that we do not want to apply, we have to look at Gatineau and say: Why don't you want it in your backyard, if it's not that dangerous? I've heard it so many times in the last few years that I have a hard time keeping my emotions in line.

1665 So, we're sacrificing a human community, but we have to also look at the nature. Like the young boy, he talked about these animals. It was very touching, but the animals cannot talk, and nature cannot talk. But then if they were at the hearings, they could also say that they don't want that project as well. It's not because nature cannot express itself that we have to overlook it. So, I thought it was very important and very important that a child reminds us of this, and you'll probably hear it from other citizens, certainly.

1670

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) And the fairness between generations, that should be considered?

1675

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) Of course, the sustainable development is something that reminds us of the generations to come. So, if we do with a - we have such a site, it's just storing residual matters that still exist. We know that these plastic bags will take five hundred (500) years maybe to deteriorate. So, they're not biodegradable matter. It's going to be there for centuries. And so, what are we going to do with burial site? It's that let's get rid of it, because, on the short term, it's going to be there for twenty (20) years and, after us, the flood. You know, that doesn't matter what happens afterwards.

1685

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) In the event that we would have tri-composting and like technique or other alternative techniques, what would happen with these levels of problems? How would the municipality accept that?

1690

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) Yes, we're not talking about the same size here. We're talking about ten (10) hectares. The project, with the buffer zone, the infrastructure, is about like three hundred (300) acres. So, if we look at the plasma gasification, it's four (4) acres. It's not even two (2) hectares. We're not talking about the same scope. In terms of pollution, it's not even comparable. So, it's hardly polluting, in fact. So, this is an energy that's recovered.

1700

But there's modern incineration which is very popular in Europe. And to clean the gas that comes from incinerators, these gases are not as polluting or polluting in such a low level that

they are acceptable. And if Sweden, who is a small country, and Germany, a small country, find places where the people accept that, it's because they have arrived to a level of technical - or technique development that the people are able to accept that.

1705 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You think they're accepted easily without a level of opposition that would be different from here?

1710 MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) There's probably a bit of opposition, of course, but there are opposition and opposition. I think that everything is in proportion. If I'm told that they're going to put near my place a plasma gasification project on four (4) acres of land or four (4) hectares of land, I might not object, but if we're talking about three hundred (300) hectares or three hundred (300) acres, I can't remember the amount, but that is quite a difference.

1715

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) You said that the two (2) companies that did these impact studies, Fondex and Teknika, would look after the landfill site.

1720

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) I got that from a letter from the promoter written to the Association of Lake Danford the 23rd of December, 2005. He wrote that the Fondex company and Teknika had merged, and that they would be associated to the operation of the - or management of the project. When we saw that, we already - already, the promoter will be judge and party. And he funds the project, and they do the impact study, and they're associated to the economic profits. Then, I find that something - that's not right. I mean...

1730

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Was that presented at the commission?

1735

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

(Translation) Yes, it's one of my appendix or attachments.

1740

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you so much.

MS. MICHELE BORCHERS:

1745

(Translation) You have that letter.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1750

(Translation) So, thank you; now, the spokesperson of the municipality La Pêche, Mr. Robert Bussièrès. So, before starting, Mr. Bussièrès, I'd like to make an announcement. If there are people who wish to make a presentation Saturday afternoon, people that are here that would like to make a presentation during the session of June 16th, starting at two (2:00) p.m., could you please notify the coordinator? We'll be able to hear one person tonight after your presentation.

1755

MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

1760

(Translation) Good evening, first of all, I'd like to thank you to allow me to speak tonight. I'm Robert Bussièrès. I'm Mayor of the municipality of La Pêche. La Pêche is located south of the municipality of Low and some twenty (20) kilometres north of the City of Gatineau.

1765

La Pêche is a municipality of six hundred (600) square kilometres, among one of the largest ones in Quebec, with a permanent population of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) people and close to four thousand (4,000) tourists or people that come for the cottage country around the lakes.

Therefore, we're opposed, and we sent to your Minister and the Ministry an unanimous resolution stating that we're opposed to the arrival of this project in Danford Lake.

1770

Impacts as much for our municipality as for all Outaouais Valley citizens, well, we believe that these impacts will be considerable, and we deem we cannot mortgage the future of our future generations for practical reasons.

1775

The fact that we have to bury or find a solution to process residual matter, we feel that there are other solutions than simply allowing the creation of a landfill site. There are so many other new technologies that we were made aware of that we could use, and we asked your Ministry to start a study to test these new technologies. There are many technologies available throughout the world, one of them that is more known here in Quebec and in Canada, plasma processing. These are technologies that would be worthwhile to look at.

1780

I don't know if the Ministry thought about the other impacts that we would have here with the heavy traffic on a road like the 105 or the 301, who have not been constructed to greet this type of traffic, hundreds of trucks per day, because most of the waste will be coming from Gatineau, so, many trucks. And Road 105 is so dangerous that we would considerably increase

1785 the fatal accidents on this secondary road.

So, these are all elements we have to consider before authorizing the creation of such a site at Danford.

1790 The municipality of La Pêche is aware and concerned about its environment. We are open to door-to-door recycling. We're conducting currently a study on different methods of composting and different compost containers to see what would be the best solution to reduce the mass, the volume of waste that we send to the landfill sites to maximize the reduction of the waste. And that's something that all municipalities should also consider before adopting such a solution.

1795 So, our proposal would be to consider plasma processing technologies. By the way, the La Pêche municipality is considering this technology and implementing it in our municipality. We are looking at what they're doing in Ottawa. We're following them closely. By the way, I was in contact with them today. Their mill will be in production very soon.

1800 I would like to ask the Government of Quebec to obtain results of the study of this new technology.

1805 I believe that this solution is probably the solution of the future. It allows us to transform our waste instead of burying it, transform it in many ways in reusable matter. It can be incorporated in asphalt, concrete, and you can even transform this material into finished products and recuperate entirely all gases to produce energy. So, I believe it's something that should be considered to see if this technology is as good as we claim it is.

1810 And I sincerely believe that such a solution is much better than the method proposed right now, which is to simply bury, store, and this remains a high risk technology. Everybody knows it. And why should we jeopardize the future of our future generations when there are other technologies that exist throughout the world?

1815 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Thank you.

1820 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) The project you talk about, plasma processing in Ottawa, this is an experimental project, if I understood well? Is this...

1825 MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

(Translation) It's the first pilot project. It's a mill that will treat sixty-five (65) tons per day.

Of course, a pilot project, this type of mill in Canada, it's important to look at the results obtained. However, it's not the first mill in the world of this type. There are others that exist throughout the world that provide good results.

1830

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) It's still going to take some time before obtaining results and then moving to another step.

1835

MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

(Translation) Don't you think that we should take the time to consider other possibilities instead of allowing the creation of a site, simply because we're seeking a fast solution?

1840

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) I'm not saying to find a fast solution, but there are other solutions, other alternatives.

1845

MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

(Translation) Well, yeah, we may consider other alternatives, maybe other technologies that will be reassuring for us and for the environment. We're open to those. We're open to any.

1850

THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Because, incineration technologies or tri-composting, we don't have to conduct studies, because they were studied and they have energy value and reduce residual matter.

1855

MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

(Translation) When I talk about a plasma processing mill, that doesn't mean that's all we'll use. We must continue to recycle. We must continue to encourage composting and recuperate everything we can before sending the rest of our domestic waste to the plasma processing plant.

1860

The volume in Outaouais Valley is considerable. We're talking about two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) tons of waste currently in the Outaouais Valley. The Outaouais Valley is one of the regions in Quebec that is experiencing the fastest growth. A lot of people are moving to this region, because the economy is pretty good here.

1865

1870 And with the volume we have right now and the volume we'll end up with even after having recuperated as much as possible, there'll still remain a considerable volume. And that will allow us also this technology to redistribute the volume of waste everywhere throughout the Outaouais Valley instead of concentrating in the same place, and increase the risk of toxic accidents, and not deteriorate our roads that are already in pitiful condition.

1875 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) In your municipality, what is the rate of recuperation or enhancement of residual matters compared to the objectives set by the Ministry of Environment?

1880 MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

(Translation) Well, we started with the big plastic containers that we had everywhere on our territory close to our businesses, where we conducted about ten percent (10%) recuperation in the recyclable matter. And now, today, with our door-to-door technique, we recuperate about twenty-five percent (25%) of the volume.

1885 There's still some work to be done. There's still awareness to be made, but all this will be done, and people participate without hesitation. And there are two hundred (200) businesses, small businesses, in our municipality that are participating, and that's considerable, but we're...

1890 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) When you talk about twenty-five percent (25%), that includes businesses, industries, and residential?

1895 MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

(Translation) Yes.

1900 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) Thank you.

1905 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Yes, for commercial and industrial and institutions, have - the institutions, the businesses, do they have a choice of saying, no, we're not going to participate in the approach of the municipality; we're going to manage our residual matter ourselves; we're going to

1910 hire a transportation company; we'll bring that where we want, or is it part of a taxation of the municipality, and is this included in the services you offer to the institutions, the businesses, and the industry? How does it work?

MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

1915 (Translation) Well, they're taxed directly on their tax bill for the collection of all this matter. Of course, this is an amount that is easy to identify on the bill. So, all of them.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1920 (Translation) For domestic waste and for the elimination, that's part of the tax bill? Can I not pay the tax and manage my own waste? Is that possible?

MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

1925 (Translation) No, by the way, that wouldn't be profitable for the businesses.

THE COMMISSIONER:

1930 (Translation) Because they're not numerous enough. The volume is not important enough. Is it - but the question we want to know, if it's legally possible?

MR. ROBERT BUSSIERES:

1935 (Translation) Well, currently, we just think the rates for citizens and for businesses, bringing it down for businesses is more, but, businesses, if we look at volume, their volume versus the residential volume, well, residences pay more per volume than the businesses. So, it wouldn't be profitable for them, and they know it. And we know it by going through a private contractor that it costs certainly much more.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1940 (Translation) Thank you, thank you for your presentation; I just want to make sure. Is the representative of Sustainable Development, Environment, and Parks still in the room? Yes, okay, so, the objective, the recycling objective, is sixty percent (60%) of what is recyclable and not sixty percent (60%) of the volume, total volume. Can you come up and clarify that for us?
1945 Therefore, sixty percent (60%) of what is recyclable and what is estimated to be recyclable in the municipal waste, I think it's sixty percent (60%). Is that true?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

1950 (Translation) Yes, you're right. When we talk about sixty (60), sixty-seven percent

(67%), it's always of what is recyclable. What is recyclable is not a hundred percent (100%) of the waste, depending on the matter. All we can say is sixty percent (60%) for municipal waste. However, you can - in construction and demolition, you can reach eighty (80), ninety percent (90%) in certain cases.

1955

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

(Translation) Very well, so, when we say a municipality has twenty-five percent (25%) in weight, the objective for domestic waste and weight, it's something, sixty percent (60%), of sixty percent (60%), therefore thirty percent (30%).

1960

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) No, in the policy, the different sectors had different objectives. You know, it's an average of sixty (60), sixty-five percent (65%), but you have to - you know, with metal, there's maybe higher volumes we can reach. Construction, demolition matter, yes, we can get a lot. So, it depends on the type of matter, but always of what is recyclable.

1965

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1970

(Translation) Do you have any corrections to make tonight?

MR. JEAN MBARAGA:

(Translation) Well, maybe one slight correction, a participant here said the recyclable waste that come from Ontario would be accepted in Quebec or acceptable in Quebec, if they reach a level of fifty percent (50%) of what is recyclable. There's no such figure that it runs at.

1975

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

1980

(Translation) Okay, thank you; is Ms. Marie-Thérèse Kaseef still in the room? Yes, so, if you'd like to say something, I hope I said your name right.

MS. MARIE-THERESE KASEEF:

1985

(Translation) Yes, my name, Marie-Thérèse Kaseef, a resident in the municipality of Kazabazua for thirty (30) years, and I live directly on Road 105.

I'd like to say that this project is jeopardizing highway safety. There are three (3) reasons why I am against this project. I wouldn't want to see this carried out, because it jeopardizes

1990

highway safety. Year after year, accidents are on the increase, because there are many more residents than before, and they work in the city. So, there is intense traffic.

1995 Highway safety is covered by a very little team. There's one police patrol car at night, and that's it, and, during the day, maybe one (1) or two (2) cars maximum. So, it's the police station in Maniwaki that is in charge of our sectors.

2000 This project has an environmental cost, too much of a cost, and doesn't take the municipalities into consideration.

2005 Being the only access road northward from Ottawa and Gatineau, Road 105 has been given - well, is considered a trucking road, even though it was improved in the last twenty (20) years. Between Wakefield and Kazabazua, it's more a tourist road than a commercial road.

2010 I have three (3) or four (4) examples. The north exit of Wakefield close to the old railroad track must scare many truckers. These are very steep curves without visibility in certain areas. There are often accidents. And how about the three (3) lane sections where automobile drivers try to pass at high speeds anything in front of them? So, increased truck traffic will only increase the risks of accidents.

2015 Also, the environment and the cost, this is another reason; the more changes, the more it's the same in our said evolved society. Anything that bothers us we eliminate. Seagulls, for example, we heard during the previous hearings that we shoot them down. So, we attract these seagulls with waste. And after that, they bother us, and we kill them or we introduce falcons.

2020 We hear the promoters and government officials talk about these efficient methods in a situation that has no reason to exist. Other environmental risks that are recognized in studies have priceless - are priceless.

2025 Despite all the promises of the promoter, who promises to take care of all the problems, once you contaminate the water, there's nothing that can be done. You can't fix it. And studies prove that our oceans are sick because of the pollution brought by the rivers that flow into them, which bring many pollutants to the water. So, even if you have good rules, well, you have to apply them, and that's where there's a problem.

2030 Anyhow, leachate remain toxic even if they're processed, and this situation was debated by marine biologists extensively in 2006. The costs to turn the situation around and marine help are different to imagine.

My other item, take into consideration communities. Popular wisdom wants that when you're in doubt, you abstain. And the main idea of this is - well, in profitable projects like this

2035 mega dump, the local population is ignored, set aside, because the promoters anticipate their reactions. We heard the promoter and government officials say that the site proposed is a good site on a geographic level, but they didn't consider the life of the residents that will have to pay the price of the consequences of this project.

2040 If so many communities refuse this waste management approach, wouldn't it be time to consider other approaches? Any type of solution that involves burying such as tri-composting, by the way, should be set aside, because burying only dry material is not a guarantee of non-pollution. And, well, look at the Cantley dump. This only recuperates a certain percentage of leachate and biogases. So, it's not very good.

2045 So, to eliminate waste, whether it's by gasification, by plasma processing, or any other method in a closed circuit is, on the contrary, a positive element, because the waste is used to produce energy and idle matter that can be reused. Such a local situation would help to reduce the long transportation. This technique does not need to use composting and recycling. The negative impacts, in the long term, are eliminated with technique.

2050 In Kazabazua after more than a year and tight negotiations, the septic mud mill project was accepted. They accepted that, because they were able to take part in the decision-making and make modifications and improvements to the project. It's clear that also the public management and not private of the mill creates quite a difference in the respect of the rules.

2055 In our society, we talk a lot about saving, well, avoiding monetary debts for our children, but we've got to consider the environmental debt. Why do we decide on certain techniques, because we think it's too expensive, but we think that the price of fixing things up and recuperating is too high also? So, I'd like to truly - I'm asking that the Danford site not be materialized.

2060 THE COMMISSIONER:

(Translation) The commission is at a step of analysis and not of opinions, but I understand, without underestimating the amount of trucks, the information we have now is, say - well, they're saying it's ten percent (10%) more, and we know that there are too many right now, so, ten percent (10%) more, whereas, on the 301, the impact would be much more important. So, if we increase only ten percent (10%) more trucks on the 105, it's still unacceptable for you.

MS. MARIE-THERESE KASEEF:

2070 (Translation) Oh, absolutely, absolutely, there are already too many, and it's not a road that is safe at all. From Wakefield to Kazabazua, before Wakefield maybe, it's a double lane,

but, between Wakefield and Kazabazua, well, it's not a trucking road. Nevertheless, we still have a lot of - too many trucks.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2075

(Translation) Thank you; so, now, we're at the period for rectification, for corrections. There's one person registered for correction making, Mr. Denis Rouleau. So, as we're waiting for Mr. Denis Rouleau, I'd like to - you know, the people that have tabled a brief and that need - require corrections, you have a right, and I invite you to do so, to counter-correct, if you wish, or
2080 notify the commission of this, but in writing. Therefore, you'll have up to next Friday to rectify some elements. There will be some until Wednesday. We'll put them on the site, and we'll invite you to react, if need be, but only for very short facts. Therefore, good evening, Mr. Rouleau.

MR. DENIS ROULEAU:

2085

(Translation) Thank you, Ms. Chairman; I'd like to make a correction on the brief read by Charlene Scharf. However, I have to consult some documents and information received from the municipality of Alayn-and-Cawood. So, I'll submit this correction as soon as possible.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2090

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

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2095

(Translation) Please understand that there's a speaker, a question from you, Mr. Commissioner, concerning the claims that Teknika HBA and Fondex, after having merged, would be involved in the LDC sanitation and environmental services. I'd like to make a rectification here, if you'll allow me to refer to the document that was used as a reference by Madam. In appendix 1
2100 of 2 in the impact study, in the main report, therefore, on appendix J, we find question 10 which was answered to the coalition, a description of the LDC firm. We find here, and please allow me to read it in English:

"LDC mandated the sanitary landfill specialist from Teknika HBA to assist the company in the management and operation of the CIEVO. Fondex Outaouais recently joined the Teknika HBA group. The vast experience in the field of technical landfill for residual matters of Teknika HBA and the personnel of LDC that has more than twenty-five (25) years of experience will make it possible to operate the CIEVO in full compliance with the CA of the Ministry of Environment".

2105

2110

So, in fact, this is in the impact study.

However, the rectification I would like to make, the correction I would like to make is as

2115 follows. When we talk about assisting, because it's well written here, assist the company, you must understand that an engineering firm like us, when we assist a company, it's simply in the rule on incineration and burial of residual matters. There are many requirements in the regulations, as the ones existed previously on solid waste, in which an engineer must be involved in the exploitation of a landfill site.

2120 That doesn't mean he's a partner or there's a business relationship or financial participation with the firm or with the promoter. That simply means that, according to the rules, an engineer of any firm must conduct independent studies required according to regulation.

2125 Allow me to refer to these independent studies. The first one and not the least important of all is that, following the decree, let's say the decree is positive, well, we'd have to prepare a request for a certificate of authorization in conformity with the impact studies and the decrees with all the recommendations. In that instance, there's a whole engineering firm that must be mandated to realize the plans and make a request for the certificate of authorization following the deposit of the decree.

2130 So, of course, we'll be there to prepare this request for a certificate of authorization, since we already conducted the impact studies and the preliminary plans, but who knows, maybe following an offer of professional services that we'll submit, that Genivar, SNC Lavelin, and other engineering firms make that we're going to - that doesn't mean we're going to win the offer. We hope so.

2135 And after every five (5) years, we have to enlarge the site. So, there's still plans to come up with. You can't just expand a site of sixty (60) hours overnight. So, every five (5) years, there are plans to come up with. And it can't be done by the promoter, because the promoter has no technical services. We will also be on the list. And there's also follow-up of analysis on the river that must be done by an independent firm according to a sampling guide.

2140 THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2145 (Translation) So, okay, we know. So, the correction is according to facts. So, you're telling us that the manager has to be accompanied by an engineer for these steps.

MR. ANDRE POULIN:

2150 (Translation) Exactly, and allow me to conclude by saying that Teknika HBA has no business relationship. It's a firm that is completely independent from LDC. We currently work for West Management and for other companies in the field of waste processing. We don't work exclusively for LCD.

THE CHAIRWOMAN:

2155

(Translation) Very well, thank you; so, I don't think there are any other registrations. So, this will conclude the session for this evening. We are going to be here again tomorrow at one o'clock (1:00). So, thank you and good evening.

2160

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

2165

AND I HAVE SIGNED:

2170

ANNAGRET RINALDI,
Official Court Reporter.