

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 - D R A F T -**

Date: 1998 May 28
Time: 7:00 pm
Location: Town of Deep River, Municipal Building, Meeting 208

Attendance:

Councillor D. Burton, Village of Chalk River, Chairperson
Councillor C. Robinson, Townships RBWM
Councillor D. Walker, Town of Deep River
Mr. B. Bigham, SLC Chairperson
Mr. M. Richardson, Superintendent, Town of Deep River
Ms. A. LeClair, NRWMB Project Coordinator

Affected Property Owners

Mr. S. Blimkie
Mrs. I. Bilimkie

1. Review and Acceptance of Minutes of Last Meeting

April 30, 1998:

The following corrections/revisions were requested:

- p. 2 - correct the word "Pettawawa" to "Petawawa"
- p. 5 - replace reference to "small time operator" with "local contractor"
- p. 3 - Item 5 - Revise agreement to "in-house agreement".

Councillor Robinson motioned to accept the minutes with revisions; Councillor D. Walker seconded the motion; motioned accepted.

2. Business Arising from Meeting

3. Correspondence

Ms. LeClair distributed a revised list of correspondence to members and reported on a significant amount of correspondence received after the distribution of the meeting packages (refer to revised correspondence list). Ms. LeClair reviewed the correspondence with members.

4. EA Approval

Review, Comment and Motion to Approve Draft Press Release

Board members reviewed the draft press release and recommended the following changes:

- Councillor Walker suggested replacing "... near the village of Chalk River." with, "in the Town of Deep River", and Councillor Robinson suggested adding the phrase "on land to be purchased from the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited."
- In the second paragraph, line 2, Councillor Walker suggested to replace the phrase "...left some scars.", with the wording "...been both arduous and expensive."
- In the third paragraph, Councillor Walker suggested to remove the phrase "... without raising property taxes.", and to remove the phrase "...under the circumstances.", since it was redundant. Also, there was agreement to delete any references to the issue of amalgamation, therefore, it was suggested to revise the last statement in the paragraph to read, "The Board feels confident that the ongoing intermunicipal partnership for the delivery of a long-term waste management system will be successful".

All Board members agreed to the above recommendations. Chairperson Burton directed Ms. LeClair to revise the press release and forward it to the three local papers: NRT, Petawawa Messenger, and the Observer.

Review, Comment on Update to Affected Property Owners

Board members reviewed the draft update. No comments were expressed. Chairperson Burton directed Ms. LeClair to finalize and distribute the update.

Mr. and Mrs. Blimkie explained that correspondence was received from the Ministry of the Environment on the issue of the Notice of Approval, however, the Ministry provided them with the incorrect Notice of Approval. It was also expressed that they would like to forward a copy of the Notice of Approval to their lawyer as soon as possible. Ms. LeClair explained that the same problem occurred with the Board, and reported that a copy of the Notice of Approval will be attached to the update; a copy of both the update and the correct Notice of Approval can be faxed to Mr. Huckabone as soon as possible. Ms. LeClair committed to making the issuance of the update and the attached documentation a priority.

Update to SLC and Letter of Thanks to Members of Former PLC

Ms. LeClair recommended issuing an update to the members of the SLC. Mr. Bigham agreed. Ms. LeClair reported to have drafted a letter of thanks to the members of the former PLC, and recommended to seek the review and approval of the draft by the Chairperson, before issuance. Board members agreed.

5. EPA Approval

MOE Review of Draft Certificate of Approval

Ms. LeClair reported that the Ministry's EPA approvals branch has received feedback from the District Office on the draft Certificate of Approval. Turnaround time on feedback from the Regional Office is expected to take several months.

Land Acquisition Documents: Progress on Review and Approval

Councillor Walker reported that Mayor John Murphy requested action from AECL with respect to its feedback on the draft legal documents. Representatives from AECL promised to submit commits several

weeks ago, however, no comments have been received so far. Councillor Walker added that Mayor Murphy has committed to followup on his original request.

Design Modifications

Ms. LeClair distributed a package of correspondence containing the following:

Feedback on Modifications from Gartner Lee/Janota Patrick - May 27

Table: Detailed Design - Discussion on Detailed Design Modifications

Ms. LeClair stated that the table of information provided tracks the issues with respect to design modifications from the initial meeting on April 2, 1998 to recent feedback received from the Public Works Personnel, the consultants and the MOE's representative, and recommended a presentation on the suggested modifications be based on the contents of the table. Chairperson Burton directed Ms. LeClair to proceed.

Ms. LeClair presented each issue to the members of the Board, and the following comments and approvals resulted:

Issue 2: Bagg's Road Design Speed.

The Board will proceed with to recommend to the Townships Council to pass a by-law to restrict the speed limit on Bagg's Road to 40 km/hr when Bagg's road is upgraded and operational.

Mr. and Mrs. Blimkie reported to have found some stakes on their property in the fall of 1997, and sought answers from the Board as to why they were there. The Board could not respond to Mr. and Mrs. Blimkie's enquiry. Ms. LeClair reported to have explicitly instructed the consulting firm. Janota/Patrick, not to trespass on private property unless required, and further clarified with the engineering firm that permission to access the private land must be obtain before conducting the survey work. Ms. LeClair added that in response, the consultant assured the Board that there was no need to access private property. Mr. Blimkie enquired about the width of the road allowance. The Board stated that the road allowance was 66 feet wide. Mr. Richardson was reminded of the need for the stakes, and explained that when conducting surveys for the purpose of design work, typically the survey will be conducted beyond the scoped area to obtain a better understanding of the elevations and topography, whether the elevations drop or rise. Ms. LeClair apologized for the inconvenience, further adding that the Board would have sought permission under the circumstances.

Issue 3: Bagg's Road/Access Route -Double Surfacing vs. Paving

Additional Comments: Mr. Richardson summarized his experience with double surfacing:

Essentially, double surface treatment doesn't stand up to trucks. Double surfacing is typically used on roads with low traffic. The road would be surfaced twice initially, then it would need a surface treatment several more times until it stabilizes. The cost of double surfacing is 1/3 of the cost of paving, and 2/3 of the cost of asphalt (plus maintenance) after 2 or 4 layers. In the long run double surfacing may not pay due to higher maintenance costs. In addition, funding for further maintenance would require approval by council which could be difficult to obtain. Mr. Richardson cited the Balmer's Bay road as an example.

Councillor Walker asked about asphalt grindings. Mr. Richardson stated that there would be equipment on site to maintain it, and the residents would probably appreciate a less expensive alternative. Councillor Walker asked about the asphalt thickness. Mr. Richardson stated that 2 inches would suffice, and an additional 2 inches could be added at a later date. Councillor

Robinson enquired about deciding on 3 ½ inches or opt for 2 inches. Mr. Richardson informed the Board that the quality of asphalt has improved in the last 15 years and cited HL3 and HL4 as common examples. This quality of asphalt does not require 3in thickness, therefore, representing a cost savings.

Final Recommendation: Board adopted the recommendation by Public Works - to pave Bagg's Rd and place asphalt grindings on the access route.

Issue 4: Access Route - Re-aligning

Additional Comments: The Board was not in favor of the adoption of realignment based on Option 1. Councillor Walker enquired about option 2. Ms. LeClair stated that there would be no significant cost savings if the access route was realigned based on option 2, and further elaborated: that in factoring curves in the redesign of the route to accommodate a safe entry into the landfill site, and a safe exit out, it would in fact lengthen the access road. Furthermore, the consultants argue that the realignment would cost more in the long run if Bagg's Road is developed in the future, since the development of the remainder of Bagg's road would require the upgrade of that portion of Bagg's Road which the Board opted not to improve initially. The consultants speculate that reducing the upgrade to Bagg's Road 150m could potentially save \$10K - \$15K, but when factoring the cost of the redesign and constructing the realignment and future development potential, the savings would most likely represent only a few thousand dollars.

Final Recommendation: The Board opted not to re-align the access route.

Issue 5: Access Route/Areas - Extending Paved Area

Final Recommendation: The Board adopted the public works recommendation to apply asphalt grindings in front of the ancillary facilities.

Issue 7: Ancillary Facilities - Too restrictive

Additional Comments:

On the tire pile: Councillor Walker questioned the proximity of the tire pile to the entrance of the site, and the potential for arsonists to set the tires on fire and creating a hazard. Mr. Richardson stated that the location of the tire pile is irrelevant since the arsonist will find a way to light the pile anyway. There was immediate consensus to forego the design of a tire shelter based on the design cost (@\$1,500).

On the issue of the perimeter road: There was some discussion on the need for gravel on the perimeter road and the need to construct the entire road from the onset. Ms. LeClair explained that the gravel would make the perimeter road more stable, especially during wet seasons, given the type of native soils which exist on site. Also, constructing the entire road from the onset would provide access to the perimeter of the landfill area to facilitate pickup of scattered litter and debris. And, it would provide access to the landfill site for security reasons. Mr. Richardson asserted that the arguments were not convincing since there are no perimeter roads around landfill areas at the existing sites, and no problems presently exist with respect to the collection of scattered litter and debris. Mr. Richardson's recommendation to the Board was to proceed with the original plan to identify the particulars of the perimeter road on the detailed design plans, but, opt not to construct the entire road initially. If the site is privatized, the decision to construct the remaining portion of the perimeter road can be left to the operator.

Board members were in favor of the reorganization of the facilities as indicated in the diagram (see attached). However, there were reservations with respect to the cost for redesign the plans. Councillor Walker expressed concern with the concept of having to pay more for the redesign when the cost should have been incorporated into the contract to begin with. Ms. LeClair informed the Board members that the original contract with Gartner Lee (and Janota/Patrick as subcontractor) explicitly indicates that the subcontractor's responsibility is to translate the conceptual design into detailed design plans. The contract does not include costs associated with changes in the design once the conceptual design has been approved by the Board, the Councils or the MOE. Councillor Walker, supported by Mr. Richardson, contended that Gartner Lee- Janota/Patrick should have consulted the Board before translating the design concept into detailed design plans. Ms. LeClair asserted that this exercise was conducted prior to the completion of the conceptual design and final design and operations report (Gartner Lee, February 1997). Councillor Walker argued that the design is "generic". Ms. LeClair asserted the design was specific to the needs of the municipalities, and that nowhere was it stated the conceptual design was generic. Councillor Walker was resolute in that the documentation on the landfill site indicated that the design was termed "generic". Further discussion on the issue ended and Councillor Walker recommended to forward a letter to the consultants ordering them, at minimum, to reduce the cost to half. The remaining Board members supported Councillor Walker's recommendation.

Recommendation: The Board adopted all recommended changes proposed by Public Works personnel, with the exception of designing and constructing a tire shelter, and constructing the entire perimeter road. Board members directed Ms. LeClair to prepare a letter to Gartner in support of a reduction in costs associated with the redesign of the facilities.

Issue 9: Heavy Equipment - Shelter for,

Additional Comments: Councillor Walker enquired about the need for a shelter. Mr. Richardson stated if the heavy equipment resides on site on a full-time basis, the operator will want to protect the equipment from the weather and from vandalism. Mr. Richardson acknowledged that the concept of a shelter for the heavy equipment will be difficult to sell to the councils.

Recommendation:

The Board endorsed a recommendation to designate an area for a heavy equipment shelter in the revised conceptual design as proposed by Public Works personnel, however, not to include it in the detailed design plans.

Issue 10: Attendant Shelter - Sanitary Facility

Recommendation: No further comments were made. The Board endorsed Public Works recommendation to proceed with the original concept.

Supervision of Construction

Ms. LeClair distributed general information obtained from Janota/Patrick, regarding consultant fees associated with the supervision of construction by contract (as opposed to using in-house resources). Ms. LeClair stressed that the information did not constitute an official quote, and its intended purpose was for general discussion.

Mr. Richardson provided the following advise to the Board: The construction phase entails a short, but concentrated effort and timeline to complete. Using municipal resources means that municipal staff will be

required to devote a focussed effort, particularly at the beginning of the phase. This translates to loss of municipal resources to devote on the regular work for a period of time. Originally, the Board was in support of using in-house resources to save on costs. However, if hidden costs are factored into the real costs of using in-house resource, including the work which cannot be conducted by municipal staff (i.e. compaction and asphalt testing), it is figured that contracting a consultant to do the job would represent net cost of only \$20,000 above total costs. Mr. Richardson stressed the importance of gaining the securities to do the construction job right (as opposed to focusing on cost savings), and encouraged the Board and councils to vote to do the construction the right way. Mr. Richardson further recommended to consider hiring the same consultant that performed the design work for the Board. In this way, the consultant can be held accountable to a certain degree should their exist problems in the construction of the project based on the detailed design work.

6. Operations

Preferred Governance/Management Model: Progress

There was mention of an upcoming meeting of Heads of Council scheduled for June 4, 1998, on the issue of a preferred governance/management model.

Proposal by Janota/Patrick

Mr. Bigham expressed his view that the consulting company would probably not improve on the analysis already provided in the Board's environmental assessment proposal, and any additional benchmarking and cost/benefit analysis could be adequately conducted using the Coordinator's services and available information already on hand. Councillor Walker expressed concern over the limited amount of analysis conducted and available to Councils in the deliberation of choosing a preferred governance/management model. Ms. LeClair affirmed Councillor Walker's view, stating that the initial expectation by Councils was for the Clerks to provide to councils an in depth cost/benefit analysis on a select 2 or 3 models.

Responsibility for Further Action

Ms. LeClair requested clarification on further action with respect to the proposal offered by Janota/Patrick. Councillor Walker recommended that the proposal be forwarded to the Heads of Council, and await further direction. Board members agreed.

7. Finance

Monthly Report

Ms. LeClair reported that a monthly update was not available in time for the meeting.

Budget Submission 1998: Progress of Approvals by Councils

Councillor Walker stated that a committee meeting was to be held on June 3, 1998 to deliberate over the Town's 1998 fiscal budget. Councillor Walker added that the Town will not review its capital budget until it can better understand the consequences of the downloading of responsibilities by the Ontario Government. Ms. LeClair reported that the Board received correspondence from the Townships which expressed the Council's endorsement of the Board's budget submission, in principle, and motioned for further deliberation by the Townships' finance committee before final approval. Chairman Burton reported that the Village's finance committee had no comments on the budget submission. Board members were in agreement that the approval process of the Board's budgets submission will be slow this fiscal year.

8. SLC Update

No new issues to report.

7. Other Business

Municipal Compensation

Councillor Walker recommended that the municipalities proceed with an agreement on the maintenance of Bagg's Road now that the Board has settled on the design modifications. Councillor Walker added that the Physical Environment Committee have concerns about future development of Bagg's Rd, and there is a recommendation to put something in the in-house agreement which speaks to the issue. Chairperson Burton stated the Village's desire to see an in-house agreement similar to an agreement drawn up by legal counsel, but made by the municipalities. Councillor Robinson surmised that the Township may have a draft available already.

Barricading Bagg's Road

Councillor Robinson enquired about the possibility of placing a barricade at the end of the upgraded portion of Bagg's Road to deter traffic flow to the site from Miller's Road when the site is operational. Ms. LeClair believed that AECL has identified Bagg's Road as their alternate route in an emergency and that the road allowance would require to remain open at all times in order to meet their safety and licensing requirements. Ms. LeClair offered to confirm this information with AECL.

Presentations to the Municipal Planning Committees

Councillor D. Walker stated that the Physical Environment Committee admitted to knowing little about the new landfill site and the landfill process, and put forth a recommendation to have Ms. LeClair present a brief summary of activities, the process, and a description of the new landfill site. It was mentioned that a site tour would be desirable as well. Other members recommended the same presentation be made to their respective committees/councils as well.

Amendments to the Town's Official Plan

Councillor Walker reported that Greg Pulham, the County's planner, provided the Towns' planning committee a revised Official Plan in draft form for an initial review by the committee. Councillor Walker further added that when a final draft plan is available, the plan will be forwarded to the Board for comment, before it gets finalized.

Next Meeting

Chairperson Burton proposed the next and subsequent meetings to be held on Mondays instead of the usual Thursdays. No other members objected to the proposal. All members agreed to meet on the 4th Monday of every month, starting June, 1998.

Prepared by: _____

Date Accepted: _____