

**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  
MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Date:** 1997 September 30

**Time:** 2:00 pm (in-camera); 3:00 pm (open)

**Location:** Townships RBWM Municipal Building, Pt. Alexander

**Attendance:**

Councillor T. A. Nicks, Townships RBWM, Chairman

Councillor D. Burton, Village of Chalk River

M. Richardson, Superintendent of Public Works, Town of Deep River

B. Bigham, Site Liaison Committee, Chairman

Open Session Only

S. Hollingshead, Consultant/Partner, Gartner Lee Limited

J. Janota, Consultant/Owner, Janota/Patrick Engineering Firm

B. Whitehead, Consultant, Janota/Patrick Engineering Firm

**Part 1: In-Camera Session (separate attachment)**

**Part 2: Open**

**3. EA/EPA Update**

**EA- Notice of Acceptance - Status**

**EPA- Board Response to MOEE Technical Review Comments**

**4. Financial Update**

**5. SLC Update**

**6. Other Business**

Discussions on all agenda items in Part 2 as above were preempted by the presentation by Gartner Lee/Janota Patrick. Please refer to a subsequent memo to Board members dated 1997 October 8 for information.

**7. Site Development/Operations**

*Proposal for the Contracting of Services - Presentation by Gartner Lee/Janota Patrick*

*Introduction by S. Hollingshead, Gartner Lee Limited*

The purpose of the presentation was to introduce and propose to the Board different models for the contracting of services ranging from the traditional operations and maintenance of the site to the fully privatization of the site, including management services. Mr. Hollingshead impressed upon the

members that Gartner Lee would be interested in continuing its working relationship with the Board beyond the approvals phase of the project.

Mr. Hollingshead stated that the original intent was to make the proposal more specific in terms of the economics associated with each model in relation to the circumstances surrounding the new North Renfrew Site and compare the benefits and drawbacks of each model. However, basic costing figures were not available to provide benchmark costs for the assessment. Mr. Hollingshead concluded that the best approach to the presentation would be to outline in general terms, the steps and decisions the Board be required to make before conducting a detailed financial assessment to assist the Board in identifying a preferred model for contract services.

Mr. Hollingshead introduced Mr. J. Janota and Mr. B. Whitehead, both representing the engineering firm Janota/Patrick. A handout entitled, "Briefing Notes: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NORTH RENFREW WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN" was distributed to all present at the meeting.

### *Briefing Notes*

#### *IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NORTH RENFREW WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN*

##### *1. Steps Towards Implementing the Waste Management Plan (p.2) - S. Hollingshead*

Mr. Hollingshead proceeded to describe the steps towards implementing the new North Renfrew Waste Management Systems Plan.

With respect to the requirement of benchmarking costs, Mr. Richardson asked why existing costs should be used as a benchmark, considering that present costs would not necessarily be reflective of circumstances associated with new site and the new system. Mr. Hollingshead stated that current costs are the only good basis for projecting future costs. Mr. Hollingshead added that there is one consideration in that with respect to using public works staff to deliver the system, there are costs associated with overhead that are buried.

##### *2. Benchmarking the Existing System (p. 3) - S. Hollingshead*

Mr. Hollingshead outlined the various components to the present waste management system and described the accompanying method of delivering the service. Costs associated with the delivery of the services under the present system were estimated, and obtained from various documents, and financial summaries and contracts supplied by the Board's project coordinator, Ms. LeClair.

##### *3. The Range of Options for Implementation (p. 5) - J. Janota*

Mr. Janota described the variety of options available to a municipality, and offered comparisons. Mr. Richardson stated that the fully privatization option would not be possible due to agreements with AECL with respect to accessing their lands to manage the attenuation zone. Mr. Richardson further added that the insurance issues would have to be spelled out really clear. Mr. Richardson did add that the Design/Build/Operate and the Design/Build/Operate/Finance options were considerations, stating that there would be a possibility of displacing a permanent employee, but it remains to be seen how the municipality will benefit from it.

Mr. Janota questioned whether there existed for the Board an issue with respect the degree of control over the management of the landfill site. Chairman Nicks stated that the municipalities were interested in pooling staff resources for supervising the construction of the landfill site. Mr. Richardson made the point that whatever is set up will require senior staff time, but it would be effective to the municipalities

if the responsibilities and attendance were kept to a minimum. Also, Mr. Richardson stated that the municipalities position is that they do not want to hire staff unless that that person is prepared to deal with added responsibilities, and used the example of the function of managing the cemetery, which does not require full time staff but is nonetheless a necessary function and requires a staff member to devote some time to the responsibilities. This function presently gets bounced around from on staff member to the next because of an overloading of responsibilities.

4. *Potential Benefits and Risks with Privatization (p. 5/6) - B. Whitehead*

One point Mr. Whitehead raised was with respect to the limited knowledge base which smaller municipalities can draw from municipal staff. Contracting the management of the landfill site to a company with the specialized expertise may be more expensive, however, there would be long term benefits, such as more efficient usage of landfill capacity.

Chairman Nicks asked about the length of a contract. Mr. Hollingshead stated the terms of a contract, such as contract length, are variable, but did point out that long-term contracts are of benefit as the annual fees are typically lower. Mr. Hollingshead reinforced Mr. Whitehead's point as above by adding that the advantage of having the private sector manage the facility is that the companies typically have a broader range of expertise and skills and are available to the client on short notice. Mr. Richardson countered the point as he was not of the opinion that special expertise would be required on short notice at a waste management facility. Mr. Richardson did, however, recognize the potential need for someone to manage the entire North Renfrew waste stream.