

NORTH RENFREW WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

c/o Townships of Rolph, Buchanan, Wylie & McKay
R.R. #1, Deep River, Ontario KOJ 1P0

Telephone: (613) 584-9194

Fax (613) 584-3285

**North Renfrew Waste Management Board Meeting
Minutes of Meeting**

Date: 1997 April 24

Time: 7:00 pm

Location: Townships Rolph, Buchanan, Wylie and McKay, Municipal Office, Pt.
Alexander, Meeting Room

Attendance:

T. Nicks, Chairman, Councillor, Townships RBWM

R. Roiha, Councillor, Town of Deep River

D. Burton, Coouncillor, Village of Chalk River

J. Kolar, SLC representative

A. LeClair, Project Coordinator

M. Richardson, Superintendent, Town of Deep River

Sydney, Iona and Wayne Blimkie

Brian and Earl Gust

L. Baker

1. Review and Acceptance of Minutes of Last Meeting 1997 April 3

Councillor Burton moved to accept the minutes of last meeting; Councillor Roiha seconded; minutes accepted.

2. Correspondence

3. Business Arising from Last Meeting

Budget

Ms. LeClair attended a meeting with Village of Chalk River Council on April 8 to discuss details of this year's budget submission. One issue raised during the meeting was the need for separate insurance coverage for the Board. Councillor Burton stated that a response from the Board has yet to be received by the Village. Ms. LeClair reported that a response was provided by telephone to Ms. Rantz several days after the meeting. Ms. LeClair communicated to Ms. Rantz that separate insurance is required as per the intermunicipal agreement (clause 11.1) and that Mr. Hickey in a previous discussion rationalized that the Board, although formed by the three municipalities, is considered a separate entity, and that due to the sensitivity and nature of the activities performed by the Board, separate coverage would be warranted. Councillor Burton requested that the response be forwarded to the Village in writing.

It was reported that the revised budget submission was approved by all three municipalities.

4. EA/EPA Review and Approval Processes - Update

It was reported that the public review period Environmental Assessment agency (Blue) review ended at the beginning of April. One submission from the public was received by the Ministry. The EA proposal and other documentation will be forwarded shortly to the Minister for acceptance and approval. With respect to the EPA review process, there was nothing to report. The formal review is in process and comments from the review are expected at the end of May, possible mid-June.

5. Property Owner Compensation

Several property owners, and/or representatives attended the meeting and expressed the following concerns/issues:

Accountability; Reliability; Stability of Board Membership

Mr. Wayne Blimkie raised concerns regarding the stability of Board membership as he pointed to the fact that members keep changing and questioned the reliability or worth of the Board commitment to its word because of it. Mr. Blimkie asked how many members are no longer on the Board. Mr. Blimkie asserted that what his family wants to see are commitments from the Board in the form of signed documents.

Chairman Nicks responded to Mr. Blimkie's concerns by stating that the intermunicipal agreement which has been agreed to and signed by the three municipalities is what legally binds the Board to its commitments, and not Board membership. Members of the Board are elected municipal officials and the municipalities have the right to change membership on the Board, and membership changes for various reasons. Any elected official appointed to represent the municipality on the Board, at any time, is said to be working on behalf of the Board.

Anything that is produced on North Renfrew Waste Management Board Letterhead, signed or not, irrespective of Board membership at that time, is legally binding. Minutes of meetings, for example, are legally binding. Minutes of meetings are public documents and copies may be obtained at municipal offices upon request.

Chairman Nicks further added that the Board was created to look after the waste management planning of a new waste management systems plan and the establishment of a new landfill site, following the Ministry's Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Protection Act (EPA) requirements. This year, the Board will be involved in property owner and municipal compensation and land acquisition from AECL. When approval is obtained from the Ministry and AECL, then the Board will be able to finalize compensation to property owners.

Need to attend Board meetings/need for lawyer present

Mr. Baker wanted to know why property owner compensation was being discussed then at the meeting, and, questioned the need to have lawyers present. Chairman Nicks responded by stating that as a planning board, the planning of property owner compensation process is one of the items to be discussed in the overall planning process. Ms. LeClair added that Mr. Baker was

informed about the meeting as a way of allowing the Baker family an opportunity to access the landfill site process to obtain more information until such time as the Board is prepared to negotiate compensation claims. The original request to make the Board meetings more public/accessible originated from the Blimkie family, requesting that the Board forwarded copies of the meeting agenda, thus, the distribution of agenda was extended to the Baker family as well. Chairman Nicks further added that a lawyer at this point in time is not needed as the Board is not prepared to negotiate compensation, however, Chairman Nicks stated that property owners are certainly invited to bring one, if owners feel the need.

Litter control

Mr. Wayne Blimkie expressed a concern with respect to the potential for litter extending onto their property, along trails and the like. Mr. Blimkie reported to have found litter on the Blimkie property originating as far as the Deep River Landfill Site, and anticipates the problem to be a major, ongoing concern with the new site to be situated so close.

Ms. LeClair affirmed Mr. Blimkie's concerns and stated that it is difficult to imagine that the new site will be operated differently than existing sites in the area, and suggested to Mr. Blimkie that any comparisons of the new site with existing landfill sites should be made in reference to the Alice and Fraser Landfill Site in the Pembroke Area, and not with existing landfill sites in the Deep River area. Ms. LeClair reported that a recent tour of the Alice and Fraser landfill site proved to offer promise that the new landfill site can be clean and well controlled if well managed, like the landfill site in Pembroke. In addition, Ms. LeClair stated that the difference between existing landfill sites and this new site is that the new site will be strictly controlled and heavily regulated from the beginning. Existing landfill sites were not well controlled 20-30 years ago, which explains the reason why many existing sites have control problems now.

AECL Financial Contribution

Mr. Wayne Blimkie queried as to AECL's financial contribution to the process. Chairman Nicks stated that cost allocation is shared amongst the three municipalities whereby Chalk River contributes approximately 10% of the costs; the Townships share represents approximately 27%; and, the Town of Deep River pays approximately 66%. AECL is an industry situated within the municipal boundaries of the Town of Deep River. AECL pays the Town of Deep River a grant in-lieu of taxes, based on the value of the property, which represents approximately 2/3 of the Town's operating budget. Therefore, AECL contributes 2/3 of Deep River's share of 66% of the Waste Management Board costs.

Renfrew County interest in Waste Management

A concern was raised with respect to the potential for the County to take control of the new landfill site. Status on the process was requested. Chairman Nicks stated that the Renfrew County has the power to control waste management interests within the county. Presently, the County's Governance Review Committee, which is mandated to review existing delivery services and recommended changes, has recommended that the County adopt a two tier approach to waste management delivery which would see the County assume control over existing sites, keeping the larger sites open (including the new North Renfrew Site) and closing the remaining smaller sites. The perpetual care of the closed sites would remain a municipal responsibility.

Chairman Nicks added that municipalities will have the opportunity to vote on this recommendation at the end of the month. The Board had submitted in March a response to the Committee which expressed the Board's lack of support for the recommendation. Ms. LeClair stated that property owner concerns regarding county control were incorporated into the response.

Summary of Board Responsibilities and Accountability

Chairman Nicks reinforced the following points regarding Board responsibility and accountability:

- The North Renfrew Waste Management Board is a legally constituted board;
- The Board is mandated to look for new waste management systems plan to handle North Renfrew waste for the next 25 years;
- All minutes are legal documents; whatever is on record is legally binding, no matter who is on the Board at the time;
- The Board submits a budget every year;
- The Board is following Ministry of the Environment and Energy planning requirements, and all plans and designs must be approved by the Minister/Ministry of the Environment and Energy.
- The Board is doing a job to find a waste site to serve every person in North Renfrew.

Property Value Protection

Mr. L. Baker asked whether property owners will be compensated for loss in property value.

Ms. LeClair stated that property owners will be compensated for loss in property value, according to the principles found in the Landfill Compensation Policy. Ms. LeClair also stated that each property owner has been provided a copy of this policy in April of 1997. Chairman Nicks added that property owners who qualify will be compensated for injurious affection as well. However, compensation does not extend to property owner's surrounding the Miller's Road landfill site.

Radioactive/radiological contamination

Mr. Wayne Blimkie raised concern with respect to the potential for radioactive contamination at the new site. Chairman Nicks stated that the previous public committee, the Public Liaison Committee, had originally made this an issue. Ms. LeClair pointed out to the Board that this issue was raised during the property owner meeting in mid-March, and it was requested to forward a letter to AECL, on behalf of the property owners, wanting assurances from the company that contamination won't happen. Councillor Roiha assured the property owners that monitoring for radioactivity will take place when the site is operational. Also, Chairman Nicks pointed to the fact that AECL is not the only source of radioactive contamination, and that domestic waste material presently allowed in landfill sites (such as tritium watches and smoke detectors) contain small amounts of radioactive material.

Leachate Contamination at Maskinonge Lake

Mr. L. Baker asked about contamination at Maskinonge Lake. Mr. Baker reported that this problem presently exists at the Miller's Road Landfill Site.

The Board stated that very little leachate is expected to reach Maskinonge Lake. The attenuation zone, where the leachate is predicted to travel, will be monitored on a regular basis at points west of the Lake, allowing municipalities to solve leachate problems before the leachate has a chance to reach the Lake and negatively affect it. The difference between the two sites is that of prevention as opposed to reaction. With respect to the Miller's Road site, remedial action is being done to rectify the problem after the fact, whereas the new site will have in place a monitoring program and contingency plans as a measure of prevention, before the leachate has a chance to negatively affect the lake, if ever there should be a problem.

Proposed Opening of the New Site/Contracting out of Maintenance

Mr. Wayne Blimkie queried as to the in-service date of the new landfill site, and whether the maintenance of the operations will be contracted out.

Ms. LeClair responded to the first query by stating that the municipalities anticipate the opening of the new site to be in early Fall of 1998. Chairman Nicks responded to the second query by stating that the Board's mandate revolves around the planning of the new site and the contracting out of the maintenance will be handled by an operating authority that will supersede the Board.

Disposal of Sewage Sludge at New Site

A question was raised with respect to the disposal of sewage sludge at the new site.

Chairman Nicks responded by stating that the new site will not be certified to dispose of sewage sludge, however, the municipalities may opt to consider obtaining approval from the Ministry to dispose of sewage sludge sometime in the future, after the landfill site is operational.

Control of Waste Disposal at New Site

Mr. Wayne Blimkie queried about the volume of waste to be disposed at the new site, and queried as to the types of waste allowed for disposal (such as stumps, and large volumes of waste).

In response to the first query, Chairman Nicks stated that the volume of waste to be disposed at the new site has been estimated, and that the municipalities will be required to follow the restrictions set out in its Certificate of Approval and the terms and conditions in support of the Certificate. During the Environmental Assessment Study, the Board studied the North Renfrew Area and estimated the volumes and types of waste presently being generated by the three municipalities and predicted how much waste will be generated within a 25 year period. This information can be found in the Board's TASK 1 final report.

With respect to the second query, Chairman Nicks stated that the municipalities will be doing everything in its power to divert as much waste from landfill as possible. Mr. Blimkie, being a taxpayer and all, was concerned about getting refused at the site. Mr. Richardson stated that any taxpayer will be refused to dispose material into the landfill if the material to be disposed by the taxpayer is not considered garbage. Ms. LeClair added that large volumes of waste will be handled on a case by case scenario. For example, if someone is requesting to dispose of a large volume of demolition waste, an assessment will be required to determine what waste materials will be disposed in the landfill, and what waste can be diverted for reuse, recycling. Mr. Richardson stated that it is a Provincial requirement to divert waste generated in large volumes

(by activities such as demolition, for example). Chairman Nicks referred to the Petawawa National Forestry Institute (PNFI) Phase I demolition project where the Townships assessed how to manage the disposal of the waste to be generated by the demolition of some of the buildings. It was realized after the assessment, that very little waste was to be disposed in the Buchanan landfill area. Most of the waste was to be diverted for reuse or recycling.

Chairman Nicks extended the Board's appreciation to the property owners for attending the meeting.

Review of Minutes of Meeting - 1997 March 11/Claims Assessment Process/Information Meeting on Compensation

These issues were not discussed, due to insufficient time.

6. Municipal Compensation

Elements of Municipal Compensation/Review of Past Processes

A draft list of elements of a municipal compensation agreement were distributed to Board members. The list of elements (including methods of payment) were drawn from about a dozen sample agreements. The list was produced for the purpose of initiating discussion with individual municipalities to identify individual municipal issues with respect to municipal compensation before the Board drafts the agreement.

Board members reviewed the list. Ms. LeClair was directed to prepare before the beginning of May, a revised list for further discussion with municipal councils. The new list would include the following: roads maintenance and upgrading; by-law enforcement; water supply; loss in tax revenues; and claims fund.

7. Land Negotiations (CONFIDENTIAL)

See attached.

8. Financial Update

A financial update was not available at the time of the meeting..

9. SLC Update

Ms. LeClair reported that there are plans to hold an SLC meeting in the next month.