

PUBLIC HEARING

SYDNEY TAR PONDS AND COKE OVENS SITES

REMEDIATION PROJECT

JOINT REVIEW PANEL

V O L U M E 13

HELD BEFORE: Ms. Lesley Griffiths, MCIP (Chair)
Mr. William H.R. Charles, QC (Member)
Dr. Louis LaPierre, Ph.D (Member)

PLACE HEARD: Sydney, Nova Scotia

DATE HEARD: Friday, May 12, 2006

PRESENTERS: Sydney Academy:
Mr. John Fitzgerald & Ms. Rochelle McGrath

JCI (Junior Chamber International):
Mr. Keith MacDonald & Mr. Doug Lionais

Sydney & Area Chamber of Commerce:
Mr. Owen Fitzgerald & Mr. Bruce Maloney

Cape Breton Partnership:
Mr. Keith MacDonald, Mr. Pat Bates and
Mr. Bruce Maloney

ECO Canada:
Mr. Grant Trump & Mr. Greg Arsenault

Recorded by:
Drake Recording Services Limited
1592 Oxford Street
Halifax, NS B3H 3Z4
Per: Patricia Cantle, CCR

I N D E X O F P R O C E E D I N G S

	PAGE NO.
THE CHAIRPERSON - OPENING REMARKS	2178
SYDNEY ACADEMY	
MR. JOHN FITZPATRICK and	
MS. ROCHELLE McGRATH - PRESENTATION	2181
JCI (JUNIOR CHAMBER INTERNATIONAL)	
MR. KEITH MacDONALD - PRESENTATION	2206
SYDNEY & AREA CHAMBER of COMMERCE	
MR. OWEN FITZGERALD - PRESENTATION	2266
CAPE BRETON PARTNERSHIP	
MR. KEITH MacDONALD - PRESENTATION	2296
ECO-CANADA	
MR. GRANT TRUMP - PRESENTATION	2335

QUESTIONING

SYDNEY ACADEMY -	
MR. JOHN FITZPATRICK	
Questioned by Joint Review Panel	2186
Questioned by Mr. Frank Potter (STPA)	2194
Questioned by Ms. Mary-Ruth Maclellan (SOHC)	2196
Questioned by Ms. Debbie Ouelette	2198
Questioned by Dr. Les Ignasiak	2200
Questioned by Ms. Neila MacQueen	2201
JCI (JUNIOR CHAMBER INTERNATIONAL -	
MR. KEITH MacDONALD	
Questioned by Joint Review Panel	2224
Questioned by Mr. Frank Potter (STPA)	2243
Questioned by Ms. Debbie Ouelette	2247
Questioned by Mr. Patrick Fitzgerald	2252
Questioned by Mr. Ron Marman (GLRR)	2254
Questioned by Ms. Mary-Ruth MacLellan (SOHC)	2258
Questioned by Dr. Les Ignasiak	2263

I N D E X O F P R O C E E D I N G S

PAGE NO.

SYDNEY & AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE -
MR. OWEN FITZGERALD

Questioned by Joint Review Panel	2274
Questioned by Mr. Frank Potter (STPA)	2282
Questioned by Ms. Mary-Ruth MacLellan (SOHC)	2285
Questioned by Joint Review Panel	2292

CAPE BRETON PARTNERSHIP -
MR. KEITH MacDONALD

Questioned by Joint Review Panel	2312
Questioned by Ms. Mary-Ruth MacLellan (SOHC)	2327
Questioned by Dr. Les Ignasiak	2329
Questioned by Mr. Duff Harper	2331

ECO-CANADA -
MR. GRANT TRUMP

Questioned by Joint Review Panel	2364
Questioned by Mr. Frank Potter (STPA)	2373

I N D E X O F U N D E R T A K I N G S

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
FOR THE SYDNEY TAR PONDS AGENCY		
(1)	To provide information to the Panel about the Community Engagement Fund	2328

1 --- Upon commencing at 12:50 p.m.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ladies and gentlemen, I
3 would like to get the afternoon session of the hearings
4 under way, and since we have people here this afternoon
5 who I know have probably not been present before, I'll
6 just do a very, very brief introduction.

7 My name is Leslie Griffiths. On my right
8 is Mr. William Charles. On my left is Dr. Louis
9 LaPierre, and the three of us make up the Environmental
10 Review Panel for the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens
11 Remediation Project.

12 So, what we'll be doing here this
13 afternoon is, we have a number of presentations, and all
14 the presentations have a time limit on them, and
15 hopefully that will be plenty of time to present views
16 and opinions.

17 And then we will have an opportunity for questions
18 afterwards, and the Panel always leads off and usually
19 has some questions, and then I will provide an
20 opportunity for others to have questions as well.

21 So, that's the way we will do things.

22 I'd like to welcome everybody here this
23 afternoon. We're always pleased to see anybody at the
24 hearings, and we've had good attendance.

25 But I have to say that on a beautiful day

1 like today, if you're here you get -- definitely get
2 extra points. That's tremendous.

3 And obviously, I would particularly like
4 to recognize and welcome the students of Sydney Academy,
5 who have come here both to present and to -- those of you
6 who have come to support your fellow students who are
7 presenting.

8 We are very pleased to have you here, and
9 hope that you find the process of some interest to you,
10 and I'm sure you'll be contributing to the process as
11 well.

12 So, before we go on with the
13 presentations, I -- we always have to do what we call
14 housekeeping, and this refers to the fact that during the
15 sessions, from time to time, people ask questions about
16 something and additional information is needed.

17 So, that's -- various participants will
18 say, "We'll bring that information in at a later date"
19 and then it's officially marked on the record, it appears
20 in the transcript, and then, you know, two or three days
21 later, we receive that material.

22 So, that's generally what we have to do at
23 the beginning of each session.

24 So if you can bear with us, it only takes
25 a couple of minutes, usually.

1 So I will start off by asking the
2 proponent, the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency, if they have any
3 undertakings that they need to present.

4 MR. POTTER: Thank you, Madam Chair. We
5 do have one today.

6 It's the letter from David Darrow, then
7 CEO of the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency, to the President of
8 Devco dated April 25th, 2005 regarding the Victoria
9 Junction letter of intent. So, we'll pass a copy of that
10 in later.

11 That's all, thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Anybody else in the room
13 who needed to put anything -- provide anything to the
14 Secretariat? No?

15 Well, then, we can move on to our first
16 presentation.

17 So, as I said before, we have a
18 presentation by the students of the Sydney Academy
19 Environmental Club.

20 And I've got two names written down here,
21 but we've got five people, so I assume that you will
22 introduce yourselves before -- as you start.

23 And I'm sure you know that everybody gets
24 a 40 minute period to make a presentation, and what I
25 will do is, about 5 minutes before the end of that 40

1 minutes, I'll let you know so that you can -- if you --
2 you can wrap up your comments.

3 So, we're very pleased to have you here
4 and looking forward to your presentation.

5 -----

6 --- PRESENTATION BY SYDNEY ACADEMY

7 (MR. JOHN PATRICK FITZGERALD, MS. ROCHELLE McGRATH,
8 MS. SAMAR ALI, MS. MARILYN BLANDIN AND
9 MS. HOLLY MUISE)

10 MR. FITZGERALD: I'd like to thank you
11 very much. We won't take the 40 minutes.

12 Good afternoon. My name is John Patrick
13 Fitzgerald, and I am a Grade 12 student at Sydney
14 Academy, and the President of our school's Environmental
15 Club.

16 MS. McGRATH: My name is Rachelle
17 McGrawth, also a Grade 12 student at Sydney Academy, and
18 I am the Vice President of the Environmental Club.

19 We are joined by the rest of the Executive
20 for the Environmental Club.

21 In anticipation of this review, we have
22 attended many meetings, and have talked to experts about
23 the proposed cleanup method.

24 We are also very pleased that so many of
25 our fellow students have joined us today to show their

1 support.

2 MS. ALI: Hi, I'm Samar Ali, and I'm
3 Secretary of the Environmental Club.

4 MS. BLANDIN: My name is Marilyn Blandin,
5 also Grade 12 student at Sydney Academy, and I am the
6 Publicity Director.

7 MS. MUISE: I am Holly Muise. I'm the
8 Treasurer of the Environmental Club, also in Grade 12.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: We are here to present
10 the findings of a high school symposium held at Sydney
11 Academy on March 31st.

12 The purpose of the symposium was to gage
13 student concern for the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens site
14 cleanup.

15 MS. McGRATH: For the symposium, we
16 invited students from all 14 Cape Breton high schools to
17 attend, and all in all, 52 high school students attended
18 the symposium, both to learn about and to discuss the
19 federal-provincial plans to clean up the Tar Ponds and
20 Coke Oven site.

21 We are very pleased with this turnout, and
22 we have many concerns that have been raised.

23 The Tar Pond Agency, Public Works and
24 Government Services of Canada made presentations about
25 their plans to clean up the Tar Ponds.

1 Additionally, we also had representatives
2 of the Sierra Club to make two presentations to our
3 environmental class prior to the symposium.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Young people don't often
5 get an opportunity to express their opinion concerning
6 the projects similar to this. We wanted to make sure
7 that our presentation to the Review Panel reflects the
8 views of as many of our peers as possible.

9 We would like now to proceed with the
10 outline of the views expressed by our peers.

11 MS. McGRATH: Essentially, students
12 support the cleanup process, and are pleased that the
13 process is now gaining momentum.

14 Despite some concerns, we have found that
15 the overall proposed cleanup method was viewed as
16 suitable by students.

17 Also, the fact that so much planning and
18 research has been done regarding this project, and the
19 possible negative consequences, provides comfort to
20 youth.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Concern was expressed
22 over the capping containment of the area, as students
23 questioned the credibility of such a method.

24 There are many myths about the Tar Ponds
25 and proposed cleanup, and these myths should be

1 addressed.

2 A public process such as this Panel Review
3 will help clear up some of these concerns.

4 MS. McGRATH: In general, we found that
5 students do, in fact, agree with the incineration method,
6 or the incineration aspect of the cleanup method, if
7 there is, in fact, the strict monitoring that we've
8 discussed -- that was discussed, pardon me.

9 Youth also wanted to know what the land
10 can and will be used for, such as if trees or buildings
11 can be put on the capped lands, if it will become a
12 baseball field, and other uses.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: Which we do not support a
14 baseball field.

15 Youth would like to see the lands used to
16 complement possible uses of our harbour, not as a golf
17 course or another baseball field.

18 Some green space would be nice, but
19 economic development is of greater significance. For a
20 healthy community, youth feel we need jobs.

21 MS. McGRATH: There was also concern
22 expressed over whether there are safety response plans in
23 place in case something does, in fact, go wrong.

24 Additionally, questions also arose over
25 what effects this project will have on local residents in

1 terms of their health, the economy, property values, and
2 even air quality.

3 If there are problems, will the government
4 help these people? This was another question which we
5 were asked.

6 For example, individuals who live close to
7 the Tar Ponds claim that the soil around their homes is
8 contaminated. What will the response from the government
9 be?

10 MR. FITZGERALD: With four hundred million
11 dollars (\$400 million) to be spent, we want to see
12 maximum economic benefit for our community.

13 How many jobs will we see as a result from
14 this project? Are we training local people for the jobs
15 that will result from this project?

16 MS. McGRATH: Some students didn't
17 initially approve of the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency's plan
18 to incinerate the PCBs from the Tar Ponds, but following
19 the symposium and the explanation of this method, most
20 now feel that it can be done safely.

21 Also, once the tight restrictions, the
22 extensive monitoring, and new technologies were, in fact,
23 explained, youth became more comfortable with the idea of
24 incineration, and with the proposed cleanup method as a
25 whole.

1 MR. FITZGERALD: Most students agreed that
2 the procedures to be used in this cleanup have been
3 proven safe and effective. We understand that these are
4 technologies that are proven and have been used in other
5 parts of the world.

6 With effective safety measures and
7 monitoring, we want to see this project move forward as
8 soon as possible.

9 MS. McGRATH: The members of the Sydney
10 Academy Environmental Club would like to thank this Panel
11 for the opportunity to present our views on this
12 important project.

13 It is the youth that will, in fact,
14 inherit the results of the project, and we are pleased to
15 have input on this subject.

16 We hope you will move forward as quickly
17 as possible to clean up the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens site
18 in a safe and effective manner, thus leaving a healthier
19 community for the next generation.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: Thanks. We're open for
21 questions.

22 -----

23 SYDNEY ACADEMY

24 --- QUESTIONED BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, thank you very

1 much for your presentation, and also, thank you to all
2 the members of the Environmental Club for getting
3 involved and holding the symposium and presenting the
4 results of the symposium to us.

5 You're absolutely right, that's -- that
6 often young people are not -- I think are not presented
7 with meaningful ways that -- for them to get involved and
8 to present their views.

9 You are also absolutely right that you are
10 really the most important generation with respect to this
11 cleanup, and your views are very important. So, that --
12 we really appreciate that.

13 I wonder -- one of -- now, your symposium
14 involved students from all over the island, is that
15 right?

16 MR. FITZGERALD: Correct. Yes.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm curious to know
18 whether you found -- how much interest you found outside
19 Sydney, and whether -- did you have to do a lot to bring
20 up people's level of knowledge, or did students right
21 across the island, were they pretty knowledgeable about
22 this, and was there any difference in the views that you
23 heard, depending on where people lived?

24 MR. FITZGERALD: They were fairly
25 knowledgeable, and they were intrigued by the idea that

1 we were having the symposium at our school, and they
2 wanted to attend and learn more about it and have their
3 comments heard.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is this the first time
5 you've held a symposium for all your fellow students on
6 the island, on an environmental issue?

7 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. As far as we know,
8 yes.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, are you going to
10 hold some more?

11 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: A lot of work? Yeah.
13 Well, my second question is, I'm
14 interested in your comments and views with respect to
15 future use on the site.

16 And you made it fairly clear that economic
17 development comes first in priorities, although you'd be
18 happy to see some green space.

19 Do you want to say a little bit more about
20 that, in terms of what kinds of activities or uses you
21 would see, and do you feel that, in general, Sydney has
22 enough green space and recreation facilities?

23 MR. FITZGERALD: We're looking -- we want
24 to complement the harbour usage with economic
25 development, such as the Port presentation that you'll

1 have shortly.

2 And we also do want to see more green
3 space for Sydney.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: From your perspective,
5 what kind of recreation facilities do you think young
6 people really want to see, and is perhaps missing now?

7 MR. FITZGERALD: We feel that there's
8 enough sports fields and baseball fields, and there's
9 more than enough golf courses, too, but some people might
10 contradict.

11 But we look for more biking trails,
12 walking trails, things such as that for more green use.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

14 I'll now ask my colleagues. I imagine
15 they have some questions for you.

16 MR. CHARLES: First of all, did you get
17 the afternoon off to come here?

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, we did.

19 MR. CHARLES: So, you're here with formal
20 authority to be absent from studies?

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. The whole -- well,
22 the Grade 12s, for the most part.

23 MR. CHARLES: Well, that makes me feel a
24 lot better.

25 In your symposium, at the end of it, did

1 you pass any resolutions or reach any conclusions or that
2 sort of thing?

3 MR. FITZGERALD: We did come to the
4 conclusion that we agreed with the incineration, as long
5 as there's a strict monitoring.

6 But we also do want to make sure that all
7 the other ideas and topics were addressed, which we
8 outlined in our presentation.

9 MR. CHARLES: All right, so you're -- you
10 had some concerns about incineration, but as a result of
11 more information provided to you, you came away with the
12 idea that it could be done safely, right?

13 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

14 MR. CHARLES: You have a number of
15 questions that you raise in your presentation. How long
16 will the cap last, and things about safety plans, if
17 something goes wrong, will there be a separate road for
18 trucks and so on.

19 I guess my question is, have these
20 questions been answered in your mind, to your
21 satisfaction? Or are they still questions?

22 MS. McGRATH: Well, with concern to the
23 transportation of the waste materials off -- to an off
24 site incinerator, that question has been answered, and
25 most of the other questions were just general interest

1 presented by the students.

2 But we feel that in general, most of the
3 presentations, pardon me, did, in fact, answer that, and
4 that, as a whole, the youth, at least the ones that we
5 were talking to, do feel more comfortable with the
6 proposed cleanup method as a whole.

7 MR. CHARLES: So your main message, then,
8 to us, is to get on with it, is it?

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

10 MR. CHARLES: Okay. Thanks.

11 DR. LAPIERRE: Thank you very much for
12 your presentation.

13 I'd like to know how many students in your
14 school participate in your Environmental Club.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: There's roughly 20 to 25
16 members of the club.

17 DR. LAPIERRE: And you discuss various
18 issues in your meetings and ---

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. Usually it's local
20 issues, but when we saw this one come up, we decided to
21 take it on.

22 DR. LAPIERRE: Are they mostly local
23 issues that you address, or global issues?

24 MR. FITZGERALD: Mostly the local issues.

25 DR. LAPIERRE: Okay. I guess the other

1 question I would have would be, I'm sure you've taken
2 time to look at the project and -- as you've indicated.

3 You know that the project is going to
4 leave most of the pollutants in the ground, and it's
5 going to cover it.

6 As the future citizens who are going to
7 inherit that green space, you don't have a problem with
8 that?

9 MR. FITZGERALD: We feel that the
10 technology is sound enough that we have faith that it
11 will go ahead, and it will protect any wildlife
12 surrounding us and that we will have a use for it once
13 it's done.

14 DR. LAPIERRE: So, it wouldn't matter to
15 you if it was all cleaned up and taken away or packaged
16 and gone?

17 The aspect of leaving it there and
18 covering it over, you've looked at both of those options
19 and you're satisfied with the present option? You have
20 no concerns that later on, you might have to turn around
21 and help clean it up?

22 MR. FITZGERALD: We think that this method
23 is the most likely for our group to -- our area to
24 actually receive.

25 We don't think that they can just take the

1 materials -- the toxic materials and make them go away.

2 There's been so many technologies that I
3 know the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency has went through, and we
4 think that they have picked the best one.

5 DR. LAPIERRE: Okay. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you.

7 So now, what I'm going to do is provide an
8 opportunity for other participants to ask questions, and
9 I'll tell you the way we do it, according to our
10 procedures.

11 I'll give a -- I'll first ask the Tar
12 Ponds Agency if they have any questions of -- about your
13 presentation, and, really, questions of clarification or
14 just getting to -- a little more information from you.

15 Then I'll provide opportunities for other
16 people in the room, and I go first to people who are,
17 like yourselves, are registered presenters. Either they
18 have made a presentation or they're going to, so they get
19 an opportunity first, and I always put some kind of limit
20 on them, as they will tell you, sometimes shorter,
21 sometimes longer.

22 But -- and then I will provide
23 opportunities for other people to come to the central
24 mike and ask questions.

25 So, with that having been said, I'm going

1 to turn to the Tar Ponds Agency and say do you have one
2 or two questions for the presenters? Mr. Potter?

3 -----

4 --- QUESTIONED BY THE SYDNEY TAR POND AGENCY

5 (Mr. Frank Potter)

6 MR. POTTER: Can I have three?

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Three is acceptable.

8 MR. POTTER: Thank you.

9 First of all, I'd like to congratulate the
10 Environmental Club. It's great to see the youth of
11 Sydney coming out to participate in this process.

12 I suspect this might be the first time a
13 high school class or club has actually participated in a
14 formal Panel review across the country, and you are to be
15 congratulated.

16 And I should ask -- add congratulations to
17 Mr. Callahan, who is the teacher who is responsible for,
18 I guess, for getting the Environmental Science course at
19 the Sydney Academy under way, and a credit to him. It's,
20 I think -- it's great to see that program being developed
21 in the school system.

22 First question, I guess, is the EIS
23 report, the Environmental Impact Statement Report, is
24 very big, 3,000 pages, 7 volumes -- yeah, you're all
25 smiling.

1 How did you go about reviewing it? Did
2 you try to look at, you know, the main volume? Did you
3 split it up amongst yourselves?

4 MR. FITZGERALD: We hired the firm Dillon
5 Consulting, and they went through the document and then
6 we reviewed it with them in meetings.

7 MR. POTTER: Thank you.

8 I guess -- we think -- the Agency really
9 feels strongly about trying to engage the youth.

10 We've often spoke at your class -- your
11 high school class, and in the future, you guys are all --
12 most, I think, were in Grade 12 moving on, but for other
13 generations, your other classmates coming up behind you,
14 what would you think would be the best way for engaging
15 the youth on this project as it proceeds?

16 MR. FITZGERALD: We hope that your group,
17 the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency, will keep on going into the
18 school and doing presentations to teachers such as Mr.
19 Callahan with Environmental Science classes.

20 MR. POTTER: And one last final question.

21 I know when we've been in talking to you
22 before, some of the students have expressed interest in
23 pursuing the environmental field. I'm just curious if
24 there are many kids in your club that are looking at
25 doing that.

1 I know the universities are trying to
2 encourage kids to stay in the science program, and in
3 that stream.

4 Are many of your kids looking at going
5 into that program?

6 MR. FITZGERALD: There are some of the
7 members in the club that are looking at going into the
8 environmental field at CBU.

9 MR. POTTER: Great. Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Potter.

11 And I would also say that I am living
12 proof that you can get involved in environmental fields
13 through the arts as well as through the sciences, so ---

14 So now I'm going to just ask, of those
15 people who are registered presenters, could I just -- by
16 show of hands, how many of you have a question?

17 So, Ms. MacLellan and Ms. Ouellette,
18 that's all?

19 So, we'll start off with you.

20 Obviously, I gave the Tar Ponds Agency
21 three questions, you get three questions.

22 So, Ms. MacLellan?

23 -----

24 --- QUESTIONED BY MS. MARY-RUTH MACLELLAN

25 MS. MACLELLAN: First of all, let me

1 apologize for being late and missing the presentation,
2 but I was held up by the train.

3 While I don't agree with your opinion, I'm
4 glad that at least you're strong enough to come forward
5 and voice it. But I have a couple of questions.

6 You said Sydney Tar Ponds Agency did a lot
7 of talking to you, and you also said that you had Dillon
8 read the -- review the EIS and talk to you about it.
9 Did, indeed, you read the EIS yourself?

10 MR. FITZGERALD: We did read the condensed
11 version, but we got the presentation from our meetings
12 with Dillon Consulting Firm.

13 MS. MACLELLAN: Did you look at any health
14 studies or any health impacts?

15 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, we have.

16 MS. MACLELLAN: For instance, are you
17 aware that the graduating class of 1975 at Sydney Academy
18 had 17 students by the time they were in their thirties
19 come down with MS?

20 MS. McGRATH: Well, that is a very
21 specific example that you're setting. So, no, we were
22 not aware of that one in particular.

23 MS. MACLELLAN: Did you research
24 incineration? Did you look at other incinerators in
25 other places, and the history of the garbage incinerator

1 that we had here when it was burning biomedical waste?

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, we did look at other
3 incinerators such as the Swan Hills incinerator, but we
4 do know that the -- our area's waste incinerator was not
5 working properly, but we have faith in this incinerator,
6 that it is a new technology.

7 MS. MACLELLAN: Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.
9 MacLellan. Ms. Ouellette?

10 -----

11 --- QUESTIONED BY MS. DEBBIE OUELLETTE

12 MS. OUELLETTE: Hi, my name is Debbie
13 Ouellette, and I just want to ask you one question.

14 On the day that the Tar Ponds Agency did
15 your presentation and you had all the students in your
16 class attend, were they the only ones that were doing a
17 presentation, or did you invite a Sierra Club member or
18 any other environmental group to hear that presentation
19 as well?

20 MS. BLANEN: We also had Bruno Marcocchio
21 representing the Sierra Club come in on two occasions to
22 present their side of how they feel about this project.

23 MS. OUELLETTE: No, my question was, did
24 you have an environment -- did you have a member from the
25 Sierra Club on the same day they did their presentation

1 for the Tar Ponds Agency?

2 MS. BLANEN: Not on the same day, no.

3 MS. OUELLETTE: No. So, really, all you
4 did get was one side of the presentation by the Tar Ponds
5 Agency? You didn't get -- we didn't get -- or someone
6 from the Sierra Club didn't get to hear that same
7 presentation?

8 MR. FITZGERALD: On the day of the
9 presentation, we did not have the Sierra Club members in.

10 But on the days before, with our class, we
11 had the Sierra Club in with Bruno Marcocchio -- Mr.
12 Marcocchio, in to do presentations to our class.

13 And I made sure that the people in the
14 class that are in the club were broken up to each table,
15 so we would have both sides discussed when we broke up
16 into groups for the afternoon.

17 MS. OUELLETTE: I think it would have been
18 nice if they would have also been on the same day that
19 the Tar Ponds Agency were doing a presentation. It would
20 have been nice to have a Sierra Club member there as
21 well.

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.
24 Ouellette.

25 I'm now just going to ask if other people

1 in the room, who are not registered presenters, if
2 there's anybody else who has a couple of questions for
3 our presenters. Would you mind putting up your hands?

4 Well, we have Dr. Ignasiak, who is a
5 registered presenter, Ms. MacQueen. Anybody else? Any
6 of your fellow students have a question?

7 Dr. Ignasiak.

8 -----

9 --- QUESTIONED BY DR. LES IGNASIAK

10 DR. IGNASIAK: I think the students should
11 be really congratulated for their effort.

12 I have, however, one question.

13 I believe you mentioned at some point that
14 you look at the Swan Hills incinerator.

15 Did you get any history of operation of
16 this incinerator, by any chance?

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I do have it with
18 me.

19 DR. IGNASIAK: Do you know, by any chance,
20 how much it's going to cost to clean when the incinerator
21 is shut down?

22 MR. FITZGERALD: Clarification, for this
23 incinerator, for this project, or the Swan Hills
24 incinerator?

25 DR. IGNASIAK: No, no. For this one that

1 we are talking about, Swan Hills incinerator, yeah.

2 Well, perhaps we can talk about that after
3 -- you know, in another discussion.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Sure.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. MacQueen.

6 -----

7 --- QUESTIONED BY NEILA CATHERINE MACQUEEN

8 MS. MACQUEEN: Good afternoon, Chair,
9 Panel, and ladies and gentlemen.

10 And thank you for your presentation.

11 I went to Sydney Academy, and so did my
12 son.

13 So, I'm -- the issue that I'm really
14 concerned is about PCBs.

15 Now, right across from where I live,
16 directly across, there are 3,000 tonnes. Right over by
17 the depot, there are 100,000 tonnes.

18 Now, about approximately four years ago --
19 I have to get my glasses on -- David Anderson, Minister
20 of the Environment, refused a ship coming into Canada
21 from Hong Kong with only 50 tonnes of PCBs. They sent
22 the ship down to St. Louis, U.S. They refused it. Then,
23 they sent it back to Hong Kong.

24 So, it is totally amazing that PCBs came
25 from an American base in Hong Kong, and they wouldn't

1 even accept their own PCBs.

2 My question is, when Canada wouldn't
3 accept 50 tonnes of PCBs, now, is it safe to burn 50,000
4 tonnes of PCBs?

5 And according to Swan Hills, from what I
6 know, the incinerator there cost eight hundred million.

7 And a 35 mile radius has caused tremendous
8 damage to the people living in that area. They can't
9 drink the water, they can't eat the fish or the wildlife,
10 and now it's going to cost one heck of a lot of money to
11 clean that place up.

12 So I was wondering if you can answer me
13 that question, please.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Just before you provide
15 a response for that, just a point of clarification for
16 Ms. MacQueen, I'll just ask the Agency to provide that in
17 terms of the amounts of PCBs versus the amounts of
18 sediment.

19 Do you want to just clarify that, please?

20 MR. POTTER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

21 The actual amount of PCBs would be 3.8
22 tonnes. That's the amount we referred to when we talked
23 about PCBs.

24 Now, there is sediment with PCB
25 contamination spread amongst it, and that's where you

1 start getting into those larger volumes. But the amount
2 of PCBs would be 3.8 tonnes.

3 Thank you.

4 MS. MACQUEEN: Thank you.

5 But I have a map home telling me where all
6 the PCBs are, and when they went to find out just exactly
7 how many PCBs were there, they -- if they had a grid,
8 they should have went down so many feet right into the
9 bedrock.

10 But they didn't do that, did they, Mr.
11 Potter?

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, if you don't mind,
13 I'm going to get back to your original questions. But --
14 so, for ---

15 MS. MACQUEEN: Okay, thank you.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: --- for the presenters.
17 So -- and now I probably made you forget what it was,
18 haven't I? Yeah. Sorry about that.

19 Just -- do you want to ask a question
20 about what it was, so you can get it clear?

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Just if we could have a
22 condensed version of your question.

23 MS. MACQUEEN: Okay. It's -- when they
24 wouldn't allow 50 tonnes of PCBs to enter Canada, now
25 they want to build -- to burn -- how many, Mr. Potter?

1 Sorry about that.

2 MR. POTTER: 3.8

3 MS. MACQUEEN: Yeah. So, would you
4 consider that being safe to burn, if it malfunctioned?

5 And there is no -- according to -- let me
6 see now.

7 I can't mention any names, but this
8 gentleman has -- all the incinerators, he has never known
9 a one that did not malfunction. Okay?

10 MR. FITZGERALD: We believe with the new
11 technology that the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency is proposing
12 with this incinerator -- maybe they can clarify if there
13 has been no other incineration that has worked, if you
14 want to pose that question through the Chair to them.

15 MS. MACQUEEN: Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. MacQueen.
17 Anybody else who has a question for the presenters? No.

18 Well, thank you very much, Mr. Fitzgerald
19 and Ms. McGrath and to the executive of the club and your
20 fellow students. Thank you very much for your
21 presentation and we hope that you'll stay involved in the
22 whole process and read the Panel Report when it comes out
23 and see where it goes from there. So, thank you.

24 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll now take just a

1 five-minute break while the next presenters come forward
2 to the table.

3

4 --- RECESS: 1:23 P.M.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 --- RESUME: 1:28 P.M.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: And we have Mr. Keith
3 MacDonald here representing Junior Chamber International.
4 Mr. MacDonald, as I'm sure you know, you've got a maximum
5 of 40 minutes if you need them and I give you a nod at
6 five minutes before the conclusion of that.

7 So, we're very pleased to have you and
8 we're looking forward to your presentation.

9 -----

10 --- PRESENTATION BY JCI - CAPE BRETON

11 (MR. KEITH MACDONALD)

12 MR. MACDONALD: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
13 Chairperson, sorry. There is a number of others of our
14 association that are going to make the presentation today
15 but we're running a little bit ahead and I'm sure they'll
16 be coming in as the presentation may be ongoing.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: So, you're fine to get
18 started, are you? And then they will come ---

19 MR. MACDONALD: I wouldn't want to hold up
20 the day.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Oh? Well, if you're
22 able -- if you don't mind continuing, that would be great
23 and ---

24 MR. MACDONALD: Great. Well, thank you
25 for the opportunity to present this afternoon. I'm Keith

1 MacDonald and I'm a volunteer with JCI Cape Breton. I've
2 been with the organization since our conception four
3 years ago. Oh, I'm already ahead of myself here.

4 This presentation has basically been
5 developed by a group thought process. It doesn't
6 represent my personal feelings on the project, so it's
7 basically JCI as an organization has put this together
8 for today.

9 JCI has put together -- put an extreme
10 amount of time and considerable organizational resources
11 into this issue over the past few years, so basically the
12 presentation encompasses our past activities with the
13 project and where we would like to see the project move
14 forward in the future.

15 JCI basically stands for Junior Chamber
16 International and we're a worldwide federation of
17 organizations for young professionals and entrepreneurs
18 between the ages of 18 of 40, we have chapters in over
19 100 nations across the world and JCI Cape Breton is the
20 local chapter that was established in 2001.

21 I'm not sure what's happening with our --
22 here we go. Our chapter mission statement is to
23 contribute to the advancement of Cape Breton in the
24 global community, providing the opportunity for young
25 people to develop the leadership skills, social

1 responsibility, entrepreneurship and fellowship necessary
2 to create positive change within their communities.

3 We also hope to energize, organize and
4 enable young professionals in the community to generate
5 significant positive and measurable change by acting as a
6 leading voice for youth in the communities.

7 In order to do this, we support and/or
8 drive the implementation of youth retention and
9 retraction strategies and foster an environment where
10 entrepreneurial people and organizations can thrive.

11 Within our operations we are governed by a
12 board of directors and an executive. Our chapter reports
13 to JCI Canada, we prepare a business plan for the chapter
14 every year, we have monthly meetings of the board, we
15 have monthly committee meetings, and the chapter
16 president meets monthly with JCI Atlantic and every
17 project requires a project business plan that must be
18 approved by the board.

19 Why is JCI involved? We're involved as a
20 voice for youth and young professionals. The project, we
21 feel, will play a major role in retaining and retracting
22 youth and skilled workers to the area. The project has
23 the ability to create opportunities for new business
24 startups.

25 The project is of immense importance to

1 the future of the area and represents an opportunity to
2 open a new chapter in the life of the community.

3 JCI members also feel that as a collection
4 of young professionals who have chosen to reside and
5 develop careers on the Island, that we feel a pronounced
6 sense of urgency in regards to the cleanup.

7 Arguably, we feel that no single issue has
8 dominated the recent history of Cape Breton like the
9 project. And the term "the project" represents the
10 Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Site remediation project.
11 So, I'm just going to utilize "the project" so that --
12 just for time purposes.

13 We feel it's an equivalent of a millstone
14 around the collective neck of the community that has
15 hindered our future growth, that has depreciated our
16 capital nationally and internationally, it's been a
17 troubling distracting and an impediment to progress, and
18 we believe that this is Cape Breton's moment to
19 demonstrate our potential and together we can, and will,
20 make a better future for generations to come.

21 How have we been involved? We've
22 participated in a meeting with local MPs and MLAs in
23 April 2004 to present our concerns regarding the
24 seemingly stalled negotiations between the Province of
25 Nova Scotia and the Government of Canada on a cost-

1 sharing agreement for the project. This was our initial
2 first public venture into addressing the project.

3 From our commencement in 2001 at our first
4 actual meeting the Tar Ponds cleanup was brought forth as
5 one of our largest priorities that we wanted to work on
6 as an organization to move forward.

7 During the session we had with the local
8 MPs and MLAs we discussed four primary concerns. One was
9 cost sharing, environmental assessment, social and
10 economic benefits and proven technologies.

11 From that meeting a go-forward strategy
12 was developed, letters to the Prime Minister and the
13 Premier at the time were put together and a meeting was
14 requested with Minister Anderson, who was the Minister of
15 Environment. A follow-up meeting with local MPs to
16 discuss environment assessment was also put together.

17 So, to continue, we've also been involved
18 in the establishment of the Community Partnership on the
19 Remediation of the Muggah Creek Watershed in 2004 with
20 the Sydney Area Chamber of Commerce. This group had
21 representatives from business, education, professionals,
22 health and labour, and we put together a strategy to move
23 the project forward at the time.

24 In order to do that, we engaged ministers
25 at the provincial and federal levels to make sure that it

1 was clear to them that the position of the community was
2 clear.

3 We also put together support for the
4 project to advocate for a safe and timely cleanup and
5 promote the comprehensive environmental assessment as
6 compared to a full Panel review.

7 We were also consulted on the CLC design
8 and provided input on the makeup of the CLC, and we
9 provided a presentation in January 2005 to Mayor John
10 Morgan, MPs Mark Eyking and Roger Cuzner and MLA Cecil
11 Clark on an approach to optimizing economic benefits,
12 which I have attached as an addendum.

13 JCI Cape Breton feels the range of
14 benefits include employment, workforce skills
15 enhancement, enterprise, business opportunities,
16 community appeal through the removal of an obstacle to
17 growth, increased property values and tax revenues.

18 Recommendations included, from JCI, to
19 develop a tri-level government position on assessment,
20 the need for economic benefits office and elicit input of
21 future site use and sustainable legacy. This is just a
22 brief summary of what our presentation was to the two
23 MPs, the Minister, Cecil Clarke at the time, and Mayor
24 Morgan.

25 We also commented to them on the project

1 description and wanted to rally community support for the
2 comprehensive study at the time. At a later date we
3 received participant funding from CEAA to comment on the
4 EIS Guidelines and we also received participant funding
5 from CEAA to comment on the Environmental Impact
6 Statement.

7 This is just a brief overview of the
8 comments that were made on the scoping document. That
9 time in history has passed, but I just wanted to provide
10 those to you for information purposes and I won't really
11 get into them. Basically, overall JCI at the time felt
12 that the full Panel process may impede the project in it
13 moving forward, but I'll get into how that hasn't
14 happened.

15 One of the issues that we talked about
16 with our first initial step into the Tar Ponds Project
17 was the agreement on cost-sharing that we had with the
18 local MLAs and MPs before the MOU. We were quite excited
19 when the MOU was announced on May 12, 2004 right here in
20 this room.

21 Actually, the ministers were actually at a
22 seat just a little bit longer than that one, because I
23 think there was about 10 to 12 different speeches, but it
24 was a good occasion as well, and we had -- Sydney Academy
25 students were also in attendance at that session as well.

1 At the time we basically felt that, well,
2 the MOU outlined -- a specific portion of it which we
3 wanted to note was that the residents of Cape Breton and
4 the First Nations people desire that effective and timely
5 action be taken to address their concerns over the
6 current environmental condition at the Sydney Tar Ponds
7 and Coke Ovens Sites.

8 And it also outlined that the principles
9 of sustainable development in recognizing the
10 environmental, social and economic dimensions of the
11 Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Sites would be committed
12 to. We felt that was very important, just to highlight
13 that again today.

14 After the MOU was signed JCI sent letters
15 of congratulations and encouragement to all the federal
16 ministers involved, the Prime Minister and the Premier of
17 Nova Scotia, thanking them for their generous commitment
18 to the citizens of Cape Breton.

19 I'm going to very briefly just chat about
20 the activities that we've pursued during the
21 Environmental Assessment phase.

22 Basically, JCI wanted to further impress
23 the primary goal of having a safe and timely cleanup. We
24 believe that the continued existence of the Tar Ponds and
25 public debate around them distracts the community from

1 imagining a positive future for the community.

2 JCI Cape Breton wants to work with the
3 community in building our future, not forever discussing
4 how we will clean up the past.

5 We felt that a full Panel process would
6 delay the project and possibly delay -- or derail the
7 project completely. Ministers Bryson and Dion set a
8 timeline for the full Panel hearings and a strong Panel
9 was selected. We feel that the Panel is doing a great
10 job moving things forward as the sessions have progressed
11 and we congratulate you on your efforts.

12 But there still is a concern that the
13 Panel is not hearing the opinions of the "silent
14 majority," which is a great deal of community individuals
15 that may not have the time to get involved and make
16 presentations, but we'll address that later on in the
17 presentation.

18 Now just some comments to the Panel. One
19 of the priorities for JCI was that proven technologies be
20 utilized for the project. Through the CEAA funding that
21 was provided for intervenor status we contracted with a
22 number of other organizations.

23 Dillon Consulting, which we went through
24 an RFP process to select them, was contracted to review
25 the Environmental Impact Statement on behalf of JCI and

1 the other organizations. Dillon Consulting's expert
2 assessment produced no evidence of concern that brings
3 into question the validity or integrity of the proposed
4 methods of remediation.

5 Based on information provided to us to
6 date, we have confidence that the project has the
7 necessary processes, controls and infrastructure in order
8 to be carried out effectively and safely.

9 One of the other key concerns for JCI was
10 social/economic benefits. Under most of the EAs under
11 CEAA they're focused on assessing the effects of projects
12 that might result in adverse environmental effects. This
13 project is actually focused on a cleanup on a highly
14 environmentally damaged area. Thus, the project could be
15 considered atypical for CEAA.

16 The Voisey's Bay CEAA EA Review Panel is
17 an example that can be viewed as a project that based
18 decisions not only based on the minimum requirement that
19 a project not result in adverse environmental effects but
20 also that a project needs to result in demonstrated
21 economic benefits so as to attain some amount of
22 sustainability.

23 It would be unreasonable to consider long-
24 term economic development opportunities as part of this
25 EA process here in Sydney. Factors that we believe are

1 important within the socioeconomic benefits framework are
2 new jobs and income.

3 Already we've seen a demonstrated hire --
4 new hires by the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency and local
5 consulting community.

6 We would like to engage and assist young
7 professionals to move to this area and develop their
8 inclusion into the community. Through that, we would
9 like to develop a young environmental professionals
10 organization here in Cape Breton, seeing that there is a
11 good deal of capacity being built within the young
12 professionals in the community.

13 Also, we would like to address community
14 image. Once the project is completed, there is an
15 opportunity to recreate the Sydney area, and then there's
16 a possibility to build a new vibrant city.

17 We also look to workforce capacity
18 identifying gaps in the local labour market and identify
19 required positions, work with educational institutions in
20 order to train and retrain and identify transferable
21 industries where these people can work in the future.

22 One other concern we had was the bidders
23 and bid criteria. We wanted organizations to identify
24 bidders to promote local resources, and shape evaluation
25 criteria so that local companies have an opportunity to

1 participate in the cleanup.

2 We also see the project as an opportunity
3 for new businesses' investment that address the gaps
4 within the businesses' capacity.

5 One thing we'd like to see is -- that the
6 STPA is working on right now, is the study on the local
7 labour and business capacity. Once that's completed,
8 we'll realize that there is some potential gaps in the
9 local business capacity so that there will be new
10 opportunities for business investment and partnering.

11 One key piece we feel that is important as
12 we move forward on the socioeconomic benefits is land
13 use, potential land use for the project.

14 JCI Cape Breton is aware that it's the
15 governments -- Federal and Provincial Governments'
16 responsibility to bring the site to a minimum level of
17 remediation which will be suitable for uses and include
18 parkland and/or commercial light industrial.

19 Therefore, we must take into account these
20 limitations when putting forward recommendations for
21 future site use.

22 JCI will be leading discussions on future
23 land use in co-operation with local groups to develop
24 ideas for integration into a new long-term vision for the
25 community. We will engage the students at all levels of

1 education to create a positive dialogue on end use.

2 We will also work with other organizations
3 to develop an opportunity for local and leading planners
4 to provide insight on best practices, and case studies
5 for other remediation sites that have been reclaimed,
6 thus creating further positive conversation and idea
7 generation.

8 JCI Cape Breton would like the panel to
9 recommend that -- a minimum level of remediation to be
10 raised based on community end-use input, if required.

11 Continuing with socioeconomic benefits, we
12 feel that the project, once cleaned up, has a potential
13 to leave a legacy for the community.

14 We realize that there is some long-term
15 risk associated with the project. JCI feels that some
16 funds should be diverted to a legacy fund of up to 5 to
17 10 percent, especially if incineration is removed from
18 the project or the project comes under budget.

19 The legacy fund should be leveraged to
20 attract new investment, new industry, new research, new
21 arts and culture opportunities associated to land end
22 use, and a new vision for the community.

23 JCI Cape Breton feels that this is a once-
24 in-a-lifetime opportunity for the community to move
25 forward with a bold new vision, recreate itself and build

1 a new city that can retain and attract youth, young
2 professionals, and become a vibrant, globally attractive
3 centre.

4 In synopsis, JCI Cape Breton is
5 disappointed with the amount of negative press
6 historically that this project has received for the Cape
7 Breton area. We feel that this is a positive initiative
8 for the community and should be supported.

9 During our dialogues, we've felt that the
10 lack of public attendance at the hearings and past open
11 houses, that were held before the panel convened,
12 suggests that the public is satisfied with the proposal
13 and are eager to have the cleanup started.

14 Over and over again, this community has
15 been consulted. I didn't want to seem obtuse with the
16 quotation but this is something I pulled out of a number
17 of letters that were sent during the scoping document
18 phase, and basically it summarizes quite a few of them,
19 which is:

20 "We've been consulted, consulted and
21 consulted again, and it is time to
22 move forward."

23 We feel that there is Tar Ponds fatigue in
24 the community. We want to move forward, and we feel that
25 the majority feel the project will never get under way

1 because of the ongoing discussions around it, and it
2 doesn't seem to be moving forward. So we feel that
3 there's a significant portion of the Cape Breton
4 community that has possibly given up all hope of this
5 project moving forward.

6 In this light here, the process is
7 intimidating and prevents the everyday citizen from
8 participating -- I'm not talking about the full panel
9 process, I'm just talking about the process of engaging
10 into the dialogue that's ongoing historically around this
11 project.

12 It's been very difficult, and possibly
13 turbulent at times, in being able to have the various
14 organizations from the community that work together on
15 moving the project forward, and at times it really keeps
16 people out of being engaged, after observing some of the
17 things that have happened on the ongoing process to move
18 this project forward.

19 I wanted to use the analogy here that
20 there's a number of individuals that I'm sure would feel
21 it very intimidating to go out in public and make a
22 public statement on behalf of an organization, or even
23 themselves personally, and that they may receive an
24 unexpected amount of public backlash, possibly, or some
25 individuals possibly questioning their grounds for taking

1 a particular stance on the issue.

2 We feel that there should be more open
3 dialogue and people should be more understanding of the
4 different views in regards to this project, because
5 there's a number of them.

6 JCI Cape Breton and their membership feels
7 that the community has suffered much too long, and there
8 needs to be closure, so that we can start thinking about
9 our future.

10 JCI is committed to working with community
11 stakeholders toward the successful completion of this
12 project, and we feel that the full panel must move this
13 forward, this project forward, in a safe and timely
14 fashion and ensure that socioeconomic benefits are
15 maximized as it's under way.

16 And that is the end of the presentation.
17 I'm just putting up some information regarding JCI and
18 our contact information, and I'd be willing to field any
19 questions, as I'm sure there may be one or two.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr.
21 MacDonald.

22 Now, let me get it clear, because we put
23 you on early, you say that there were some other people
24 who were going to add to the presentation?

25 MR. MACDONALD: I was going to ask one

1 individual to come up with me just to field some
2 questions possibly, if you felt it was necessary, but I'm
3 not sure if he arrived, but I'm comfortable with staying
4 here.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's good.

6 MR. MACDONALD: I don't think I have an
7 option of going.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, it's not
9 absolutely compulsory, but no, I'm very glad, because we
10 had an additional presentation, and I wasn't sure whether
11 you were adding ---

12 MR. MACDONALD: This is the amendment I
13 was -- sorry for the interruption. That was just an
14 appendix or addendum that I presented to -- we presented,
15 JCI, to the full panel. It was just background on our
16 feelings around economic benefits, and it was put into a
17 PowerPoint presentation that we gave to the mayor, MLA
18 and Minister of Energy, Cecil Clark and our two MPs, Mark
19 Eyking and Roger Cuzner, and we dialogued with each
20 individual group based on that presentation, and I'm sure
21 it would be on the public registry if anyone is
22 interested to peruse it.

23 But the summary is that we felt that there
24 was a number of economic benefits that we thought should
25 be moved forward as the project proceeded and were very

1 important to the community.

2 Some of those -- actually, we made some
3 recommendations that were followed up on. One of the key
4 recommendations at the time was for an economic benefits
5 office or secretariat to be set up, and I'm not sure if
6 that suggestion had any weight on the decision by the
7 STPA, but after some time they actually pulled in and
8 created a position, I'm pretty sure it was called
9 Director of -- maybe not Director but Manager of Economic
10 Benefits. So we felt that was a positive step forward.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. Is
12 your colleague here, because he's very welcome to join
13 you. No one's leaping up to volunteer so okay, you're on
14 your own.

15 MR. MACDONALD: I'm on my own, yes. I
16 don't think he's here yet.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. No problem.
18 Well, thank you very much for your presentation.

19 You've made a couple of recommendations
20 within the presentation, and actually I think I might
21 just -- I might leave those for a moment, and perhaps my
22 colleagues want to ask you questions about those.

23 You made a recommendation with respect to
24 raising the -- increasing the capacity to support future
25 land use, but I'll put that off for a minute, and also

1 you were talking about the legacy project.

2 -----

3 --- QUESTIONED BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL:

4 I just -- first of all, I guess, I want to
5 make a very brief observation, and then ask you a
6 question following on my observation.

7 My observation is that an environmental
8 assessment process and a full panel review can serve many
9 purposes, but don't necessarily end up in delaying a
10 project inordinately, or even at all. But, I mean, the
11 other aspect is that through an environmental assessment
12 process, you know, concerns and issues could be
13 identified, and maybe some changes made to the project
14 that can improve it.

15 And so in connection with that, this is
16 going to be -- I'm setting aside the choices of
17 technologies for a minute. This is going to be a very
18 long project to implement, and from a business point of
19 view, does your organization -- did you discuss any
20 concerns and anything that you think would be very
21 important for the agency to know about, or maybe to
22 change in their project, with respect to the level of
23 potential disruption, traffic impacts, impacts on
24 downtown business or on business in surrounding areas?
25 Were there any of those aspects when you looked at the

1 EIS that you identified things where you wanted to --
2 would like to make recommendations?

3 MR. MACDONALD: Well first, before I get
4 right to the question, I'll just address the comment on
5 full panel.

6 During that time our organization, with
7 the researcher, we looked at different full panels that
8 happened, and we looked at the comprehensive study, and
9 we just felt that, at the time, because of the JAG
10 process and the lengthy period of community consultation
11 that went under way during the session, or during the
12 past, that it kind of circumvented the need to go to full
13 panel review.

14 But we're here, it's going along very well
15 and smoothly, and JCI is -- we had an opportunity, and we
16 took it, to be involved, and we want to thank the panel
17 for allowing us again to do presentations.

18 To move on, we, as an organization,
19 realized that there's going to be a variable amount of
20 impacts on the local community, the business community as
21 this project moves forward.

22 Our consultant, when reviewing them, the
23 significant document before you, when -- the comments
24 that were provided to us, they felt that there was, or
25 there would be and will be, enough opportunities to do

1 planning around possible disruptions through
2 communications, through identified possible times of the
3 year when it would be maybe best to do certain functions
4 of the cleanup.

5 And when it comes to the ongoing process
6 and the final design, hopefully, as we move forward, that
7 we would be able, as a community, to engage with the
8 organization that will be responsible ultimately for
9 moving the project, together with the proponent, to make
10 sure that these impacts are basically mitigated to the
11 best of our possibilities, and cause as little disruption
12 to normal life as possible.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I'll ask my
14 colleagues if they have questions.

15 DR. LAPIERRE: A few questions. Thanks a
16 lot for your presentation. I guess the -- the first
17 question I have is during the construction phase which
18 will last some time, the -- there may be dust or odours
19 or noise. Is your group concerned with the possible --
20 possibility of having disruptions due to those
21 conditions?

22 MR. MACDONALD: Our committee, our
23 organization realizes that as the project moves forward
24 there's a number of activities that are going to cause
25 some odours, disruption in traffic patterns and

1 especially when you're going to be doing the S&S
2 treatment, stabilization and solidification. If it's in
3 situ, which is proposed that there's a possibility of
4 odours.

5 But with the project it seems from our
6 consultants they've deemed that the project has been
7 examined and that there's plans in place to ensure that
8 the -- that it'll be controlled as best as possible.
9 That the consultants and engineers will ensure that once
10 the project's underway it'll be done in a fashion that's
11 safe and that the levels of odours or dust would be
12 monitored for air quality purposes so that if it reaches
13 certain level that the project could be slowed down or
14 would cease at a certain point in time, possibly just to
15 work at a lower level. But basically -- I'm rambling
16 there -- but basically we feel through our consultant
17 that was giving us expert opinion that the risks
18 associated with the project will be mitigated as best as
19 possible.

20 DR. LAPIERRE: So you have faith in the
21 engineering process?

22 MR. MACDONALD: I usually have a good deal
23 of faith in the engineering industry and I think that as
24 professionals that live here locally on the Proponent
25 side that they're going to ensure that -- I mean they

1 live and work here in the community. Their students --
2 their children are students here or their spouses live
3 here and work here in other industries or possibly even
4 together, that they'll do their best to ensure that the
5 risks are at lowest levels possible.

6 As well with any engineering company, if
7 you -- if the three consortiums that are putting in the
8 final design in looking for -- or are bidding on the RFP
9 overall have international work experience and they're
10 all tied into local companies. And I would -- I don't
11 want to get into personal thoughts but I guess personally
12 I would think any one of these companies with national
13 reputations would to ensure that they move forward if
14 they're the key final design engineers on this, that
15 their reputation's at stake as a firm. And this project,
16 if we all know, has national and international media
17 attention at times so I would venture that even some --
18 that they would look at the project as closely as
19 possible and ensure that any risk is mitigated as it goes
20 forward.

21 DR. LAPIERRE: Okay, I have -- thank you
22 for the answer. I have another question. And it relates
23 -- two-part question. First of all, it relates to the
24 capping of the Tar Ponds and the Coke Oven. As you know,
25 the great majority of the waste will still be left,

1 approximately half of the PCBs would be removed but the
2 remaining waste would stay and be capped. And I guess
3 two questions. One of them, as a community you express
4 development -- an interest for future development and my
5 question relates leaving the waste there with a cap only
6 for your organization doesn't propose -- doesn't cause
7 any concern for future development.

8 And the second question is, you know that
9 the cap is going to have a minimal strength applied to
10 it. It's a very low psi loading and compressive
11 strength. And you've indicated the need to look at
12 future development. I guess I'd like to get some feeling
13 from you whether you have any concerns over the low
14 compressive strength that's being planned for the
15 project, would you for example, be willing to see a
16 higher compressive strength added to the cap which would
17 mean it would be easier and more likely cheaper to
18 develop the land down the road.

19 We understand from listening to the Tar
20 Pond Agency that sure, you can engineer a building or you
21 can engineer I imagine anything over the cap but there's
22 a cost to that in a community such as Sydney when you
23 have to compete for businesses far and wide. If you had
24 land that's going to be more expensive to develop than
25 what people can find elsewhere, how competitive would you

1 be and the question, I guess, remains is, would you like
2 to see a greater compressive strength added to the cap.
3 I understand that it could be done.

4 MR. MACDONALD: Okay. I'll go with No. 2
5 with -- the minimum strength suggests that our priority
6 as an organization is to make sure the project moves
7 forward. But within the context of the project we would
8 hope to see funding available to possibly strengthen the
9 caps to allow for other future site uses. If that is not
10 an option due to budgets then what we'd like to do is go
11 into a community kind of phase where we work together in
12 developing the best type of -- or real consensus on what
13 the site can be used for, even though it's still at a
14 minimum remediation.

15 And that it won't be able to engineerily
16 support buildings or whatever. But there's all kinds of
17 options under that even if it's -- even if we go through
18 a land use planning strategy you can incorporate arts and
19 culture which is -- Cape Breton is very strong in. And
20 possibly have the site, even though it could be a public
21 gardens mixed in with -- we could have a process where we
22 engaged a number of artisans to put sculptures structures
23 of art pieces around the site. There's limited different
24 types of opportunities that we could look at but as an
25 organization when we are dialoging if the cap could be

1 strengthened it would just allow for more opportunities
2 when we are looking at future land use.

3 Is there a concern about -- I think one of
4 the questions was if we do add to the strength and we
5 develop the land that it may be -- the land may be the
6 cost of it to purchase or to invest in may be not as
7 competitive as other areas. I think we'd still have a
8 very good cost or advantage or competitive advantage to
9 other areas, especially when you're looking at buying
10 homes, if that's one of the things that we're looking at
11 is developing residential sites or opportunities around
12 the area as compared to major urban centres, even within
13 Atlantic Canada especially if you're looking throughout
14 the nation, we have very -- we were -- we come up very
15 competitive against cities such as Vancouver, Victoria,
16 Calgary when it comes to utilizing -- to competitiveness
17 on costs for land.

18 And I think the other question -- forgive
19 me, I was trying to take notes -- is, is there any
20 concerns at all with the cap? Is that the first ---

21 DR. LAPIERRE: I guess the question was,
22 you've expressed your views of getting on with the
23 project, cleaning the site. I guess my question that I
24 had was, with the site you are going to cap the site,
25 you're going to remove -- the project seeks for removal

1 of about half of the PCBs, half will still be left in the
2 Tar Ponds and it will be capped. Do you see this as a
3 problem where you have just covered the waste and you're
4 moving on?

5 MR. MACDONALD: I think JCI recognizes
6 that there's a long term risk associated with capping
7 that can be looked at as the project moves forward and
8 maintain -- or there can be some maintenance on it. Yes,
9 we did have concerns if -- in the presentation we did
10 have one bullet which said that basically when we're
11 looking at end uses with the site we want to ensure that
12 whatever it could be that the end product that's left
13 there can support it safely, any development.

14 So basically we want to ensure that we
15 don't come up with some idea for development 28 years
16 down the road, after hopefully we've all put this behind
17 us and then forget well, you know, we have some stuff
18 under there that we shouldn't be getting into. So we did
19 have some concerns on that.

20 DR. LAPIERRE: And I guess my last
21 question is, how many people do you represent, your
22 association groups, how many businesses?

23 MR. MACDONALD: Oh, businesses. Well, JCI
24 works on an individual basis.

25 DR. LAPIERRE: As individuals, okay.

1 MR. MACDONALD: So you buy an individual
2 membership and our membership has varied throughout the
3 years from -- when we started out, we started at 20 and
4 we've gone up to 90 and right about now we have 75
5 members I would think that are on our membership list.
6 But we also send out information and distribute
7 information about our events to wider, you know,
8 professional audience, especially for different events.
9 If we have something to do with -- I guess not everyone
10 has the same interests so it's a wide base.

11 DR. LAPIERRE: Well, thank you very much
12 Madam.

13 MR. CHARLES: Mr. MacDonald, in your
14 presentation you referred to the fact that your
15 organization was consulted on Community Liaison Committee
16 design and that you provided input into that. And I'm
17 not sure, is it input into the creation of the committee
18 membership and that sort of thing? What kind of input
19 was it that you had?

20 MR. MACDONALD: It was a meeting with a
21 contractor and some representatives from the Sydney Tar
22 Ponds Agency as well as a representative -- I cannot
23 remember her name -- from the Federal -- I'm pretty sure
24 the Federal Department of Environment. And it was a
25 consultation on what type of structure people would want

1 to be engaged in, what type of model could be used that
2 will ensure the most amount of community engagement as
3 the project moved forward as a sounding board which they
4 can take back to their membership and basically we
5 thought -- well during the -- there was a number of
6 people in the room and I think we were -- we pushed for a
7 model that would allow open dialogue and trust within the
8 representative groups that would meet on an ongoing basis
9 and would allow for open dialogue with the project
10 proponent as well.

11 MR. CHARLES: Have you any views on how
12 the committees operated?

13 MR. MACDONALD: Pardon?

14 MR. CHARLES: Have you any views on how
15 the committee has operated? Has it been effective?

16 MR. MACDONALD: Oh, yes. Well, certainly
17 -- I'm actually -- was selected -- in my previous
18 position I worked for Eco Canada who's presenting later
19 on this evening, actually. And I was sitting on the CLC
20 as the representative for Eco Canada. I was actually
21 vice-chair of the CLC. So ---

22 MR. CHARLES: You think it worked pretty
23 well.

24 MR. MACDONALD: Well, yeah, I would --
25 what we've been able to do is -- I know we've heard our

1 meetings are closed door and not open to public and media
2 but we've had a policy as members that if media
3 approached any one of us for comment that we were able to
4 speak for or against things as they proceed. We're given
5 information by the Proponent as well as the various
6 levels of government. We get to ask some questions
7 directly. We get to voice our concerns and the meetings
8 are minuted and I'm fairly certain that they're available
9 to the public if they want to view them. We have open
10 dialogue. There's -- people ask tough questions. It's
11 not just, we're all just sitting around just chatting
12 about the project but it's -- we're posing difficult
13 questions and asking how the project's proceeding and
14 we're getting the answers back from the agency and the
15 Department of Public Works and Government Services right
16 at the meetings. We've actually had CEAA
17 representatives. I don't want to -- they're right over
18 there -- at our meetings, giving us updates on how the
19 project would move forward and advising us how the full
20 Panel process was going to move forward. So we would get
21 to ask some questions and concerns as things moved ahead.

22 MR. CHARLES: Okay, thank you. The Dillon
23 Report, which was provided for your group and other
24 groups as well, was a bit critical of the EIS in the
25 sense that it didn't seem to provide a clear vision of

1 the end use that the remediated property was going to be
2 put to, and since the hearings have started the Proponent
3 has provided a lot more information about end use.

4 How do you feel about your understanding
5 of what is possible once the land is remediated? Do you
6 have a clearer picture now? I mean, Dillon says it
7 wasn't clear. Is it any clearer for you?

8 MR. MACDONALD: Yes, I think that's one of
9 the clear messages we received as the Panel commenced, is
10 that there was some questions regarding end use and how
11 that's going to proceed.

12 JCI would like to lead some of that
13 dialogue on end use, especially with the youth in the
14 area, and try and generate some ideas on some concepts
15 that would be -- could be implemented within the end use
16 to attract and retain young people.

17 And I think that's -- I'm sorry, JCI Cape
18 Breton thinks that that's one of the avenues that we
19 really want to focus on, is utilizing this project as a
20 real magnet and an attractor to support youth to stay in
21 the area as well as pull them back to the area. We see
22 that as very important.

23 MR. CHARLES: Okay. We've heard some
24 discussions earlier from the Sydney Academy people in
25 their presentation that they would be interested in

1 seeing the land used to complement harbour activities,
2 and so I take it that it wouldn't be recreational
3 activities that they would promote if they had their
4 wish, but something more akin to commercial/industrial
5 tied to the harbour.

6 And given that, I was interested in the
7 statement in the Dillon Report that the area -- and I
8 don't know whether it's Sydney or Cape Breton but let's
9 say it's Sydney -- already has a 35-year supply of
10 industrial/commercial lands available for development,
11 and the Dillon Report suggests that to think of more
12 industrial/commercial development doesn't sound like good
13 land use planning.

14 Would you like to comment on that? Is
15 that accurate? I mean, do you have a lot of land or do
16 you know if the area has a lot of land already that could
17 be developed for commercial/industrial use?

18 MR. MACDONALD: I would have to defer to
19 the consultant, and I would deem -- they did some
20 research and I would deem that that's most likely
21 accurate, their statement there.

22 But I think through a process of
23 engagement with young people, and then we could dialogue
24 about what resources are already available in the
25 community -- maybe that is something that they don't

1 realize is already -- that we already have this capacity
2 for this type of site use, and then we could -- that
3 could encourage further idea generation.

4 Not a lot of time was spent on looking at
5 future site use as a community collective, and I think
6 that once we move forward with the project that's an
7 opportunity for community stakeholders from around the
8 area to really look at the site, not just as the site
9 itself but, as JCI is pushing, utilizing -- I mean,
10 basically we're re-creating a significant portion of our
11 urban centre.

12 So, what is the -- what approaches are we
13 going to take that are going to best utilize the funding
14 that's available to ensure that once the project is over
15 that we have a real legacy that we can look at and say,
16 "Listen, this project is done, we've moved it forward and
17 now we're moving into a new era."

18 So, we would really like to be engaged in
19 that process and our executive would like to engage the
20 other organizations that have come up with studies and
21 concepts, such as the master port plan and the port-to-
22 port plan, to basically frame these all up into a new
23 long-term vision for Sydney and the CBRM.

24 And it's a very good opportunity for us to
25 dialogue and have a very positive move-forward approach

1 to this project, something that we haven't seen since the
2 dialogue started on this project.

3 And this is a way to create excitement
4 about the opportunities, it'll be a way to create --
5 especially when you're talking to younger people here
6 that, you know, they have perceptions -- we know that
7 from studies -- about the area and where it's going, but
8 we can have a real constructive dialogue and get to ask
9 them, "What will -- what can we do to keep you here?
10 What would make you think that Sydney is an exciting and
11 vibrant community?"

12 And then we can also dialogue with
13 expatriates and people -- other individuals from across
14 the country, you know, "What can -- what would attract
15 you back to this area, what would attract you to
16 Sydney?", and put this into a long-term vision for the
17 area.

18 MR. CHARLES: All right. While we're on
19 socioeconomic benefits, the Dillon Report also says that
20 while there's been a comprehensive coverage in the EIS of
21 alternate technologies and alternates to the project,
22 that the socioeconomic benefits that might be derived
23 from these alternate ways of remediating the project
24 haven't been adequately explored.

25 Do you feel the same way? Do you feel

1 there needs to be more exploration of the economic --
2 socioeconomic benefits that might flow from alternate
3 projects?

4 MR. MACDONALD: The approach the
5 consultant took is they reviewed other similar type
6 remediation projects and the STPA has found this in their
7 recent site visits, that -- now, I don't know for -- I'll
8 speak generally.

9 But generally when you look at site
10 remediation I think the process starts, or generally
11 starts, at looking at end uses and then you look at the
12 technologies available to move forward as best you
13 possibly can to end uses.

14 That's the approach that our consultant
15 thought would be the most logical way to proceed, but
16 we're far past that and we have a project at hand
17 currently and I think there still is an opportunity to
18 dialogue about future end uses.

19 I think there's an opportunity to dialogue
20 with the Proponents, there's an opportunity to dialogue
21 with the greater community and there's an opportunity to
22 dialogue with the final engineers on this project so that
23 any type of -- then we can really examine what type of
24 end uses can be put on the site.

25 MR. CHARLES: Can I interrupt you just a

1 minute?

2 MR. MACDONALD: Sure.

3 MR. CHARLES: My question is more directed
4 to the socioeconomic benefits that might flow from other
5 alternatives to the project ---

6 MR. MACDONALD: Oh, yes. Sorry.

7 MR. CHARLES: --- not the way it's
8 proposed now.

9 MR. MACDONALD: Other alternative methods
10 of remediation?

11 MR. CHARLES: Of remediation, yes.

12 MR. MACDONALD: I would just -- I would
13 have to defer to the consultant. I don't think JCI
14 dialogued enough on that particular aspect for me to give
15 an opinion on behalf of the organization.

16 MR. CHARLES: My Chair is getting anxious
17 over here and I still have one question.

18 MR. MACDONALD: Okay.

19 MR. CHARLES: I see I've driven away all
20 the students, so that's a bad sign. But I do have one
21 question, one last question I'd like to ask.

22 The Dillon Report referred to the fact
23 that they thought that the EIS was a bit deficient in
24 addressing the health and safety issues that are unique
25 to this particular project.

1 And I guess my only question is, we've had
2 discussions of the health and safety issues as part of
3 this process, and I wondered if you're any more
4 comfortable with what you've heard since in terms of the
5 -- what's been covered and how these issues are going to
6 be addressed.

7 MR. MACDONALD: I wasn't able -- I've been
8 following the full Panel proceedings, but I was not --
9 that is -- I was -- I have not been updated, I guess, on
10 what the dialogue was on regards -- in regards to health
11 and safety with the project. So, I'm not sure what --
12 how that has been moved forward or how that's going to be
13 addressed.

14 MR. CHARLES: No, that's fair enough. You
15 haven't had time to read the 15 volumes of transcript. I
16 appreciate that.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I will now
18 provide an opportunity for other parties to ask
19 questions, and I think I'm going to make it a question
20 and perhaps a follow-up question so we can move this
21 along.

22 So, Mr. Potter, do you have a question for
23 Mr. MacDonald?

24 MR. POTTER: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

25

1 --- QUESTIONED BY THE SYDNEY TAR PONDS AGENCY

2 (MR. FRANK POTTER)

3 MR. POTTER: I found your recommendations
4 interesting, but I want to back up a little bit to, I
5 guess, a general statement you made early on in the
6 presentation -- and I think I've got it right here --
7 that "JCI wants to work with the community in building
8 our future."

9 What role would you see for the Sydney Tar
10 Ponds Agency in working with your group to help
11 accomplish that same task?

12 MR. MACDONALD: I think JCI just would
13 like the support of the STPA as the organization moves
14 forward. They're fully committed to looking at potential
15 end uses and engaging the community as a whole, but
16 specifically the younger people that are going to be left
17 with the legacy of the project, and I think they have the
18 most to lose or gain from the project being completed.

19 So, we really would like to engage them.
20 And I -- the support basically, I think, our organization
21 has talked about, and they've had dialogues, I think some
22 of the executive members, with the STPA on just kind of
23 putting a plan together on how we could effectively
24 approach different stakeholders and putting -- at least
25 giving JCI the opportunity to further dialogue about the

1 issue.

2 And I think it would be a very good
3 opportunity for the first time to engage youth in looking
4 at something positive for the community and really get
5 them engaged in planning for the area's future.

6 So, I think it would just be kind of a
7 supporting role, just to ensure that we're not -- the
8 organization is just not moving out on its own on the
9 issue and -- but actually in more of a collaborate way.

10 MR. POTTER: Thank you. And I guess I
11 should state I do agree -- I think you also mentioned in
12 the presentation that for too long this has been seen to
13 be a negative initiative and it's time to see it as a
14 positive initiative, and we certainly got that message on
15 some of the tours we took.

16 The last question -- you did touch on this
17 a bit, too -- is the legacy aspect, you talk about a
18 legacy fund, five to 10 percent funding of the project to
19 go to it. We'll negotiate that later on the funding
20 amount.

21 But just how would you see that being
22 administered? What were your -- did you see the Agency
23 administering that, a separate group? What ideas did you
24 have, or did you take it that far?

25 MR. MACDONALD: I think some of the

1 membership might say that they'd like to administer the
2 fund, but I don't know how -- if that's an option, but
3 there's various different economic development
4 organizations and interests, there's various levels of
5 government proponents that are involved, and I'm sure
6 that there's -- there would be a way that there could be
7 a structure developed or an organization that already
8 exists may be able to manage that, and that's what our
9 dialogue was mostly about.

10 MR. POTTER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Actually,
12 I've just got a very -- a quick follow-up question to
13 that, which I thought my colleagues were going to ask.

14 But in your slide presentation the bullet
15 before where you talk about the legacy fund, you say
16 there will be some long-term risk associated with the
17 project and then the next thing that you said was that
18 funds should be diverted to a legacy fund.

19 Now, I was just interested in the
20 connection of those two things, because you're not
21 talking -- you know, the legacy fund is not directed to
22 environmental liabilities or anything like that.

23 But just what is the long-term risk that
24 you see being associated with the project that you think
25 could be addressed by a legacy fund?

1 MR. MACDONALD: Well, there's two aspects
2 of a legacy fund, and one was kind of a fund that would
3 be able to leverage further investment, leverage new
4 projects, leverage dollars to pull in, as I had listed
5 there, new initiatives, various new initiatives that are
6 all tied into end use.

7 But then there's also -- and it may be a
8 separate piece or it could be included in that, would be
9 the long-term maintenance of the site, because as the
10 full Panel realizes and the community realizes that with
11 any remediation project usually -- I'm speaking generally
12 again and I shouldn't be, but there's always some end use
13 risk associated with them and that we would have to
14 maintain the risk over the long haul.

15 So, we would like to know how that's going
16 to proceed. It's been dialogued but, you know, we have
17 -- as we move forward, it would have to be more of a
18 specific plan, I would think.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you.
20 That's helpful. Of the registered presenters do we have
21 any people who have questions? All right. Let me get
22 them down. I have Ms. Ouellette, I have Mr. Fitzgerald,
23 Mr. Marman, Ms. MacLellan and Mr. Ignasiak -- Dr.
24 Ignasiak.

25 Ms. Ouellette? And I think I will ask you

1 to -- just a couple of questions, please.

2

3

--- QUESTIONED BY MS. DEBBIE OUELLETTE

4

5

6

7

MS. OUELLETTE: I think you showed a slide up there that you said the lack of public attendance at public hearings and open houses -- they must be satisfied with the project.

8

9

Can you tell me how you came to that conclusion?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. MACDONALD: I didn't come up with the conclusion, but our organization, JCI, we tried to attend as many of the public hearings during the information gathering periods that were available for community input and we had thought that there would be a great deal of individuals attending these, and there was some of the sessions that we attended that there may be, other than consultants and folks that are -- that would be tied to the project, there would be a handful of people, and that was fairly surprising to us.

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, it was an open house, it was regarding concerns for the project and allowed people to come and ask the Proponents and the funding partners direct questions regarding the project, so we surmised that since there's -- there can't be very many questions regarding the project.

1 So, that's -- then we came up with that
2 bullet, that there must be consensus on the issue since
3 there was a lack of attendance at those sessions. And
4 also that could be due to the fact that through the JAG
5 process and all of these other processes the public gets
6 very confused as to why they're being engaged again.

7 I think if you ask the general person on
8 the street what's happening here in Cape Breton currently
9 with the full Panel process which is underway or even in
10 the past with the scoping document and the Environmental
11 Impact Statement and to comment on the -- we even had an
12 opportunity to comment on the outline for the
13 Environmental Impact Statement -- people are just --
14 they're also disengaged, they're just confused, they
15 don't know -- you know, if you've been consulted a number
16 of times and given your opinion, why would you continue
17 to participate in the process?

18 And that's what I meant when -- it's a
19 difficult process to be engaged in, not the full Panel
20 but the whole entering into the issue. And our
21 organization, we really had to sit down before we had our
22 first session and dialogue, you know, are we ready to
23 step into this -- and you can quote/unquote call it
24 "fray," because it's been just a negative -- very
25 negative process.

1 And especially if you're speaking as an
2 individual for a group of people -- representing --
3 sorry, not as an individual, but if you're representing a
4 group of individuals and you're the spokesperson, you're
5 going to be automatically in the public.

6 I mean, we just saw that with the
7 presenter here from Sydney Academy, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and
8 as soon as Sydney Academy said they're going to start
9 being engaged in the process, they're going to bring
10 people together, they're going to dialogue about the
11 project, you seen media attention, you had people
12 actually calling -- I'm pretty sure people called him at
13 his home, wrote him letters. Is he still here? No.

14 You can ask him what happened, but, you
15 know, it's a very intimidating process and we really had
16 to think long and hard about being engaged and -- because
17 it's just a long-standing issue and there's a lot of
18 personal feeling behind it.

19 So, we wanted to take an approach that was
20 professional. We tried to be very well prepared and we
21 tried to get as much information as possible as we
22 proceeded.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you very
24 much. Do you have one quick follow-up question, Ms.
25 Ouellette?

1 MS. OUELLETTE: Yeah. I only became
2 interested in the environment since 1998 as I became a
3 victim of past mistakes, and I speak for myself, I have a
4 lot of concerns, but I do do a lot of reading and it
5 looks to me that the option -- the capping and
6 incineration were there, placed say 10 - 20 years ago and
7 the public did speak, they spoke that they did not want
8 these two options to clean up the Coke Ovens and Tar
9 Ponds.

10 My question is, why are the three levels
11 of government and agencies still putting this option
12 forward say 20 years later and the public do not agree
13 with it? They're sick and tired of hearing the same
14 options that aren't going to work and they're not happy
15 with it.

16 So, you don't blame -- you want to know
17 why the public are not here today? Because they're
18 hearing the same excuses why these options are put on the
19 table again today. Why?

20 I mean, they want a safe cleanup, they
21 want the job done, we have no questions with that, but
22 put technologies upfront that are going to be proven
23 without a doubt that they're going to be safe for us to
24 live in for the next 20 years or so. That's my concern.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

1 MS. OUELLETTE: Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Ouellette, I didn't
3 hear a question for Mr. MacDonald in that but ---

4 MS. OUELLETTE: My question is, he's
5 wondering why the public are not here in attendance.
6 Because they did hear for the last 20 years that
7 incineration and capping -- they did not want it and
8 again 20 years later these are the same options that are
9 chosen. Why?

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I'm sorry, I still
11 don't hear a question that I think needs to be put to Mr.
12 MacDonald. You're asking questions about why the
13 government made decisions ---

14 MS. OUELLETTE: No, but he was just saying
15 the project -- like they must be satisfied with the
16 project, and to me, I don't think they would be, that's
17 why they're not here.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, but that's a
19 comment, not a question. So, thank you.

20 MR. LIONAIS: Madam Chair, may I join my
21 colleague?

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. You're ---

23 MR. LIONAIS: I'll share the burden with
24 him.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Would you just like to

1 introduce yourself and then we'll proceed with the
2 questions.

3 MR. LIONAIS: Doug Lionais, I'm an
4 executive member of JCI.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, we moved
6 ahead and -- but it was explained that you were going to
7 come, so you just squeaked in. So, that's great. Thank
8 you.

9 MR. LIONAIS: Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: We appreciate having you
11 here. Mr. Fitzgerald, for a couple of questions max,
12 please.

13 -----

14 --- QUESTIONED BY SYDNEY ACADEMY

15 (MR. JOHN PATRICK FITZGERALD)

16 MR. FITZGERALD: For anyone that has just
17 joined us, my name is John Patrick Fitzgerald, the
18 President of the Environmental Club at Sydney Academy and
19 I was just wanting to find out from you, Keith, or Mr.
20 MacDonald -- the commercial/industrial -- the commercial
21 land that we have in Cape Breton, you were saying we were
22 told that there's enough around here for 35 years.

23 And I was wondering if you agree that we
24 are looking at a different development for this port and
25 that other commercial parks around Cape Breton are not

1 accessible for a way of -- such as ports development,
2 that would be an idea, and the access to the airport,
3 it's just a much better area for an industrial park and
4 commercial park?

5 MR. MACDONALD: I think in the long-term
6 visioning plan that we get underway that even though
7 there's some comments by the -- or on the record from the
8 consultant that there is a significant amount of
9 industrial or -- industrial land that can be used, but
10 there's also the point that there's some strategic
11 infrastructure that needs support in that area that could
12 utilize the space for that type of industrial land use.

13 When you talk about the port there, that's
14 one of the infrastructures that -- you know, that could
15 gain in the future from having a more strategic tie to
16 the site currently and would create a positive effect.

17 So, we're not ruling out -- or JCI is not
18 suggesting that none of the site be used for industrial
19 use, it's just that when the plans are put in place that
20 it should be strategic and tied into a greater overall
21 vision.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: I just wanted to clarify
23 about the 35 years of industrial use, that there's still
24 some possible alternate solutions for that area. Thank
25 you.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr.
2 Fitzgerald. Mr. Marman?

3 -----

4 --- QUESTIONED BY MR. RON MARMAN

5 MR. MARMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. To
6 Mr. MacDonald, through you of course, Madam Chair, I
7 don't know if you are aware, Mr. MacDonald, that members
8 of the medical community have been presenters here, and
9 without getting into a debate on how safe or unsafe
10 incinerators are, the doctors presenting felt that just
11 the psychological effect of operating an incinerator in
12 the area could cause a problem. Indeed, one of the
13 doctors stated his family would probably not live here
14 any longer if the incinerator was in operation.

15 Does your organization have concerns that
16 an incinerator operating in the area would perhaps cause
17 young professionals not to establish here?

18 MR. LIONAIS: Our organization -- I think
19 Dr. MacCormick's arguments he was making the other day
20 were very interesting arguments, and, you know, our
21 organization -- we've taken a stand that, you know, we're
22 not engineers and we've looked at the technical and the
23 safety aspects, we've consulted with an engineering firm,
24 a local engineering firm that we trust, we've consulted
25 informally with Lydon Moore[ph] engineers, and they've

1 all given us the assurance that the proposed cleanup
2 strategy is safe and effective.

3 But I think Dr. MacCormick's comments
4 earlier in the week were quite interesting, because it
5 raises the idea of psychological effects, and what JCI is
6 saying -- our stance is that the psychological effects of
7 dragging this cleanup out for another 10, 15, 20 years
8 will be much more damaging than getting this done quickly
9 and safely now.

10 Our generation has lived with this cleanup
11 project for our whole lives. We want to move on and
12 start thinking positively about this community and the
13 exciting opportunities that this community really has,
14 and I think the psychological effects of having this
15 cleanup process go on much longer is equally damaging.

16 MR. MARMAN: Yes, I agree with you, but
17 you mentioned there that your organization was probably
18 against this full Panel review, but I think if you read
19 the transcripts you'll find out that most presenters feel
20 just as you do, that there's to be no holdup in this
21 project, but by the same token, there is nothing in this
22 project that should make things worse for this community,
23 and in particular, anything that might stop young
24 professionals from coming here and becoming established.

25 So, once again, do you feel that this part

1 of this project, whether real or imaginary, could stop
2 young people from coming here because of concern about
3 their families?

4 MR. LIONAIS: Well, we don't have any
5 studies or data to comment on that from that point, but
6 informally, if you want to just talk about anecdotally,
7 everyone we've talked to has said, "Get this thing
8 cleaned up quickly," and most of the people that -- at
9 least informally, again informally that we've talked to,
10 have been in favour of the proposed cleanup technologies.
11 They just want it started.

12 MR. MARMAN: I don't want to disagree with
13 you, but I know most of the people we talk to say, "Yes,
14 everything but incineration." But if I might, just one
15 more ---

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: One more ---

17 MR. LIONAIS: We talk to different groups
18 of people. We're here to represent the JCI in our age
19 group.

20 MR. MARMAN: Yes, I understand that. You
21 mentioned an interesting term there, "Tar Ponds fatigue."
22 I think that's something we all kind of refer to when we
23 talk about this project, that indeed the studies have
24 gone on for long enough, we're ready to begin with
25 something, we're going to pick the best of what we can,

1 in particular through this process.

2 But do you think that Tar Ponds fatigue
3 has more to do with people not coming to meetings to
4 discuss this project more so than confidence that the way
5 we're going is the right way?

6 MR. MACDONALD: I think the Omnibus
7 polling also demonstrates when looking at issues that
8 people are concerned with for the area -- and this could
9 be positive or negative, I guess, but when they rate the
10 issues that are of concern -- and the Omnibus poll is
11 this poll that's done every quarter within Cape Breton
12 and they ask different questions, and one of the
13 questions is, "What is your overall concern for the
14 area?" and the Tar Ponds is way down on the list. I
15 think it might even be on the bottom. People are more
16 concerned about jobs and employment opportunities and
17 other issues because, I think, of the fatigue factor.

18 But the community has ample opportunity to
19 engage in this process and communicate their concerns, so
20 I think our organization is more of the thought that
21 they're -- again, as the bullet said, that they support
22 the project as presented and that they don't have
23 concerns.

24 Otherwise, if there was drastic concerns,
25 you would see a lot -- a great deal more of input and

1 uproar from the community, I would venture.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Marman.

3 MR. MARMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

4 MR. MACDONALD: One point of
5 clarification, that we did not oppose the full Panel, it
6 was just that we preferred the comprehensive assessment
7 than the full Panel, but that's long ago.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: No problem. We're not
9 offended in the least. Ms. MacLellan?

10 -----

11 --- QUESTIONED BY MS. MARY-RUTH MACLELLAN

12 MS. MACLELLAN: I would like to make a
13 comment to Mr. MacDonald before I ask him a question, if
14 that's permissible.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, could you make a
16 very brief comment and then move to the question, please.

17 MS. MACLELLAN: Okay. I just want him to
18 know who I am.

19 Just so you know, I am chairperson of the
20 Cape Breton Save Our Health Care Committee. We're
21 responsible for the demonstration at the causeway that
22 had the traffic stopped as they came over the causeway
23 and handed them out masks and information about the
24 hazards they face when they enter Sydney and we advise
25 them to travel at their own risk.

1 We did this to make people across Canada
2 aware of the health risks and the health impacts that
3 have happened in the past. We've had other
4 demonstrations. I could go on.

5 We demonstrated at the cruise ships, I've
6 lobbied the MLAs, I've travelling to Halifax after
7 sitting up all night making dirt bags with the possible
8 contents that might have been in them dirt bags. Albeit
9 it was potting soil, I didn't tell them that, I just
10 passed them to the MLAs as they came into the House.

11 So, I guess what I'm trying to say is our
12 committee has a strong -- feels that we all have a strong
13 moral obligation to protect the people.

14 Having said that, I will remind you of
15 what Dante once said, that the hottest place is in hell
16 or hell for those who in times of moral certainty remain
17 their neutrality.

18 I'm wondering -- like I'm also very
19 concerned and our committee is also very concerned at the
20 blatant waste of taxpayers' dollars from across this
21 Canada and the bad mark it places on our communities.

22 Where does JCI fit in in protecting people
23 first before economic development?

24 MR. MACDONALD: Well, first to the
25 comment, I think the community needs as many

1 organizations to bring different perspectives to issues
2 as possible so we can have an open and a move-forward
3 dialogue, and we respect that people have different
4 opinions on various projects, and especially with the Tar
5 Ponds.

6 It's been such a central issue to the area
7 for so long, and we understand that, you know, people
8 aren't -- not everyone is going to agree no matter what
9 technology or what process or what mechanism we're going
10 to use for the site, but I think most of the people
11 really just want it to move forward so that our community
12 can move forward.

13 As to what JCI does for -- kind of what we
14 look at family -- or for health, is for -- I don't know
15 if we've participated in -- well, we have different -- we
16 have a varied slate of programming and it concentrates on
17 social awareness and building ---

18 Well, our mandate is to attract and retain
19 as many young people as possible, and a healthy community
20 is extremely important to the ability of an urban centre
21 to attract young people or an island to attract young
22 people, so we think it's very important.

23 But within the dialogue of the Tar Ponds
24 we felt that the -- well, sorry, the consultants that
25 we've dialogued with, they've always been giving us the

1 information that states that the risks are acceptable and
2 can be mitigated, and we can only trust our consultant
3 community to ensure that that happens.

4 MS. MACLELLAN: Do you have any idea how
5 to reverse health effects?

6 MR. MACDONALD: Pardon?

7 MS. MACLELLAN: Could you tell me how you
8 plan to reverse health effects that might happen?

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: I would like to --
10 excuse me, Mr. MacDonald. I'd just like to intervene
11 here.

12 I just want to clarify that the purpose of
13 questioning is not really to debate positions that have
14 been put forward but really is to ask questions of the
15 presenters with respect to their presentation. That
16 question is a little bit of a debating question.

17 MS. MACLELLAN: Well, I'm sorry, Madam
18 Chair, but I went to bed at 3 minutes after 6:00 this
19 morning and my phone was ringing at 6:56 again, so that
20 will tell you how much sleep I had today. But I will ask
21 one more question with your permission.

22 You spoke to the silent majority. That's
23 probably why I didn't go to bed till 6 o'clock this
24 morning, was the silent majority. Where did you get the
25 idea or how did you formulate the idea that the silent

1 majority is not speaking out because of what?

2 MR. MACDONALD: Our organization felt that
3 with most contentious issues you have a -- you have
4 different sides to the story or different -- especially
5 in Cape Breton there's different -- there'll be different
6 perspectives of opinions, and within the framework of
7 this project we felt that there was a silent majority
8 that supports the project and are not engaged in the
9 public dialogue because of the two points there, the
10 fatigue factor and also that truly they just want to get
11 to see the project done and completed and done and
12 performed in a safe manner that's respective of public
13 health.

14 So, that's where we came up with that.
15 Actually, it's in quotations, I think, in the slide, just
16 to reflect that it was a group type of quotation.

17 MS. MACLELLAN: Did you actually go out
18 and ask the people on the street?

19 MR. MACDONALD: We looked at polling data
20 and our -- we're presenting what our organization has --
21 in a group consensus approach feel is the facts, I guess,
22 or -- anyway, our version of how the community feels on
23 the project.

24 MS. MACLELLAN: Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.

1 MacLellan. Dr. Ignasiak?

2

3

--- QUESTIONED BY DR. LES IGNASIAK

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. IGNASIAK: I'll be very brief. I would like to pick on the "silent majority." I understand that what was said is that the silent majority of Cape Breton residents supports this project as it is proposed by the Agency. Did I understand that correctly?

MR. MACDONALD: That is -- that was -- I don't know how to answer that personally.

MR. LIONAIS: That is -- our organization -- and we're just one voice among many voices involved in the process here.

Our organization came up -- arrived at this conclusion after consulting with our members and with the informal casual discussions we have with people in our age group. We represent an age group of under 40s and within our daily lives and in our jobs and so forth we discuss these issues with members of that age group on a daily basis.

DR. IGNASIAK: Right.

MR. LIONAIS: So, within the discussion of our board when we discussed these things, this seemed to be the conclusion that we -- that seemed to be the reality that's out there.

1 Now, no one has actually gone out and
2 asked the silent majority and taken a poll, so we don't
3 really know. So, all we could push forward is, amongst
4 the people we've talked -- spoken with, which is
5 primarily people in the under 40 age group, we believe
6 this is their feelings on this project.

7 DR. IGNASIAK: That's a perfect answer for
8 me. Actually, what I would like to say now is you are
9 probably aware that on May 13, 2004, one day after
10 signing the agreement, the Mayor of Cape Breton Regional
11 Municipality, Mr. John Morgan, stated -- and I am
12 quoting:

13 "The planned announced primary
14 incineration and encapsulation is not
15 consistent with the recommendations
16 that come out of the community
17 consultation process."

18 As far as I know, Mayor John Morgan was
19 recently -- well, about two years ago -- elected with
20 about 80 percent majority of the popular vote. Right?

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do you want to make a
22 response to that? You don't have to. It's up to you.

23 MR. LIONAIS: Yes, John Morgan was elected
24 the Mayor of the Municipality.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you, Dr.

1 Ignasiak. Are there -- is there anybody else who's not a
2 registered presenter who has a question for the
3 presenters?

4 Thank you both very much. Thank you for
5 your presentation, Mr. MacDonald. Thank you for your
6 support.

7 MR. LIONAIS: Sorry to be late.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: No, no, you weren't
9 late, we were early. So, I apologize for that, but I'm
10 glad you were able to join us briefly, anyway.

11 So, I think we will now take a 20-minute
12 break and we will resume -- hopefully our next presenters
13 will be there. So, thank you again for your
14 presentation.

15

16 --- RECESS AT 2:58 P.M.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 --- RESUME AT 3:19 P.M.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon, we will
3 resume our session.

4 We have our next presenters, Mr.
5 Fitzgerald and Mr. Maloney from the Sydney & Area Chamber
6 of Commerce, so we are very pleased to have you here, and
7 I'm sure you know that you have a 40-minute time limit,
8 and I will give you an indication when you're getting
9 within 5 minutes of that, if you need to use that time.

10 So, pleased to have you and be glad to
11 hear your presentation.

12 -----

13 --- PRESENTATION BY SYDNEY & AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

14 (MR. OWEN FITZGERALD and MR. BRUCE MALONEY)

15 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, Madam Chair.

16 Good afternoon. I'm the proud father of
17 John Patrick, let me say first. My name is Owen
18 Fitzgerald and I'm the Executive Vice-President of the
19 Sydney & Area Chamber of Commerce.

20 And my name is Bruce Maloney, I'm the past
21 President of the Sydney & Area Chamber of Commerce.

22 We thought we would begin today by telling
23 you a little bit of our history of how we became
24 involved, and our role as we see it.

25 We probably started back in the 80s, early

1 80s, before my time with the involvement with the Tar
2 Ponds cleanup, but we've been an advocate for a safe and
3 effective cleanup method, and we've always stated that
4 that was a major thing for us.

5 We were represented on the JAG Committee
6 through the whole process. We always had a member that
7 was part of that who would come back and report on a very
8 regular basis to keep us up-to-date on what was going on
9 in the JAG process.

10 And then, when we had the precedent
11 setting alliance that was forged between the Government
12 of Canada and the Province of Nova Scotia to clean up
13 this waste site, that was normally a very appealing
14 Muggah Creek Watershed.

15 The funding agreement, we felt, symbolized
16 a coherent and integrated approach to environmental
17 enhancement, and community wellbeing.

18 A distinguishing feature of that decision
19 to proceed with the cleanup of the Muggah Creek Watershed
20 is to the extent to which the citizens of a resolute and
21 progressive community gave themselves to bring the matter
22 to a head. And I know that you've heard lots of things
23 since this started, and I'm sure that I'm just repeating
24 a couple of the issues, the thousands of hours of
25 volunteer input that have been put into it, the

1 innumerable committees that were struck, and we
2 participated in some of those, the countless studies.

3 I mean, we had one person who suggested
4 that we were, at one point, studying the studies, and it
5 was in part that we wanted to make sure that it was well
6 done.

7 There was a myriad of meetings and a
8 multitude of expert reports fuelled by a broadly
9 representative community stakeholder process.

10 Many of us were concerned that we wanted
11 to make sure that this Tar Ponds cleanup was actually
12 done. There was a feeling in the community that maybe it
13 might not, it may get derailed. And so we came together
14 and formed a community partnership for the remediation of
15 the Muggah Creek Watershed, and this was this group. It
16 was a partnership, as I said, it was shared by the
17 Chamber of Commerce and JCI Cape Breton. It comprised of
18 leaders from several key segments of the community,
19 including labour, the business, youth, health, advanced
20 learning, and the environment, and collectively we
21 represented several thousand representatives and
22 residents there.

23 We hosted information sessions, we held
24 meetings with local politicians, we sent lots of
25 correspondence to the key federal and the provincial

1 ministers. We travelled to Ottawa to meet with Federal
2 Ministers of the Environment and Public Works, and
3 Government Services Canada, and through various media
4 efforts, the Chamber informed the community regarding
5 environmental assessment options.

6 It was an important part for us, and it
7 was important for us to be part of it.

8 We hosted project update forums. Through
9 the committee and other independent activities, the
10 Chamber has continued, I think, to inform our community
11 regarding the project as it moved forward from the
12 funding announcement in 2004.

13 Now, much like you heard in the previous
14 people who were here, we were of the strong opinion and
15 favoured the comprehensive assessment. However, that was
16 not meant to be, as we found out later.

17 However, I think that rather than look at
18 it as a loss, we felt that a lot of attention was brought
19 to this cleanup, that a lot of people were informed, and
20 that we wanted to make sure that it was, number one,
21 done, and number one it was done safe and effectively.

22 The full panel, of course, was chosen, and
23 one of the things that the minister of the day came here
24 and said was, in fact, the full panel would go ahead but
25 it would be done in a timely manner, and so far it seems

1 like that's coming true and it's doing what it was
2 supposed to do, and almost in the same time manner that
3 the comprehensive assessment.

4 So the Chamber and most of the community
5 wanted -- and clearly, at the end of the day, there's
6 just one thing for us that was most important, and that
7 was the actual Tar Ponds cleanup would be done, that it
8 would be done safe and effective, and that we were going
9 with the suggestions that the agency put forth.

10 After talking with the many consultants
11 and many experts, we felt that somewhere we had to trust
12 and that was where we went, we went with what they said
13 was going to be true, and that's where we are.

14 So now I'll pass it on to my colleague,
15 here.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: So our interest today,
17 today the Chamber has two fundamental interests in the
18 cleanup. First, we want the cleanup to result in
19 strengthening both our local economy and the quality of
20 life for the people in Sydney. We also want as much of
21 the work, as possible, done by local people.

22 Our second interest is the end use of the
23 property. We will let others deal with the legacy of our
24 industrial age here in Cape Breton.

25 We would like to now focus on the future

1 and on the economic benefits and the legacy of the
2 cleanup. We feel that, for a healthy community, as my
3 son John Patrick mentioned, we need a healthy economy,
4 and we need jobs.

5 Approximately six months ago, Jerry Ryan
6 from the CBRM invited some key stakeholders to the table,
7 and these meetings started developing a plan. So we've
8 progressed, and now the stakeholders that are at the
9 table are the Sydney Tar Pond Agency, SYSCO, DEVCO, the
10 Cape Breton Regional Municipality, Sydney Port
11 Corporation, Cape Breton University, the Airport
12 Authority, Laurentian Energy Group over at Sydport,
13 Membertou First Nation, Logistec, PEV, Sydney & Area
14 Chamber of Commerce, that we're representing, the Cape
15 Breton Partnership and JCI. So all of these key
16 stakeholders are now around the table discussing this
17 important issue.

18 This group was first known as the Master
19 Port Development Planning Group but is now known as the
20 Port-to-Port Corridor Planning Group. We are developing
21 a long-term strategic plan for the development of the
22 corridor connecting Sydney Harbour and Sydney Airport.

23 The Chamber of Commerce has taken the lead
24 in this project, and I am the Chairperson. The goal is
25 to determine what the community needs to do to maximize

1 the economic development opportunities.

2 What is most exciting about this Planning
3 Group is that it has brought together all stakeholders to
4 work together, to work together focusing on opportunity
5 with a goal to develop one comprehensive plan that will
6 provide guidance and direction for economic development
7 for the next decade and beyond.

8 This is the new reality for Cape Breton.
9 We can't make good decisions in isolation or on an ad hoc
10 basis. It is obvious we need a cohesive plan. The
11 Chamber has taken a lead in this effort, and we are
12 hopeful that we can co-ordinate the completion of this
13 study with the needs of the clean-up team.

14 The harbour is our greatest asset,
15 offering the greatest opportunity, and the key
16 infrastructure component for future economic growth. Our
17 harbour can be the engine that will drive this economic
18 growth. We are presented with the unique opportunity
19 with the remediation of the Tar Ponds, the DEVCO
20 properties, the SYSCO properties, and the expected
21 divestiture of these lands.

22 This corridor includes approximately 3,000
23 acres of valuable publicly-owned land that may be
24 available for commercial or industrial development. We
25 have a unique opportunity that ironically has resulted

1 from the demise of SYSCO and DEVCO.

2 These strategically positioned public
3 lands are adjacent to some of the principal port
4 facilities, and they link all four modes of
5 transportation in the region. As well, because of their
6 proximity to Sydney Airport, Cape Breton University, and
7 the commercial centre of the CBRM, they hold the promise
8 for significant opportunities.

9 This plan fits with the efforts to
10 maximize the long-term economic benefits from the Sydney
11 Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens remediation.

12 Another study is just getting under way by
13 the Sydney Port Authority and the Laurentian Group to
14 study the harbour specifically. This group is also
15 represented on the Port-to-Port Corridor Study Group and
16 will share their findings.

17 In closing, the Chamber supports this
18 cleanup project, and we trust the experts, the
19 proponents, governments and the panel to ensure this
20 project is done right.

21 Our hope is that the remediation will be a
22 showcase for the rest of North America. Our goal is to
23 rebuild a vibrant economy with the remediated lands very
24 much at the centre of the new economic activity.

25 Many groups and experts are studying the

1 technical and the environmental issues surrounding the
2 cleanup, and we are willing to trust their expertise.
3 There will always be some risk, but the greatest risk is
4 to do nothing.

5 We feel the cleanup must proceed, and we
6 are confident the many concerned parties and this
7 distinguished panel will ensure the cleanup proceeds
8 efficiently, effectively and as safely as possible.

9 Thank you, and we welcome any questions.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr.
11 Maloney, thank you very much for your presentation.

12 -----

13 --- QUESTIONED BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL:

14 Perhaps you could just start by saying a
15 little bit about your organization, size and number of
16 businesses you represent, that kind of thing.

17 MR. MALONEY: The Sydney & Area Chamber of
18 Commerce represents the business community from across
19 Sydney and area, basically all of CBRM. We are 500
20 member businesses strong, over 500. We have grown from
21 about 300 in the last couple of years to over 500.

22 I find that most of what's happened in the
23 last number of years, especially in the business
24 community -- and we've been asked to have more input on
25 many issues that are happening here in Cape Breton -- we

1 have a lot of people from the public sector, governments
2 of the day, who do call and ask for our input to lead
3 things, to host events that might -- could have been
4 things like this with the Tar Ponds Agency. So that's
5 what we've been doing, and we'll continue to do that and
6 continue to grow.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: With respect to securing
8 local benefits from the remediation project itself, are
9 you currently satisfied that the appropriate -- that the
10 Tar Ponds Agency has the appropriate policies, plans,
11 whatever, in place to ensure that those benefits will be
12 maximized? Or have you got some things that you would
13 like to see incorporated into the project, or some
14 recommendations with respect to that?

15 MR. MALONEY: One other thing about the
16 Chamber in the last number of years is that we've become
17 accustomed to partnering with many groups.

18 One that we partnered with, went to, is
19 Cape Breton Partnership, which you will hear from next.

20 They headed up a team called the EBAT
21 Committee, which is the economic benefits action team,
22 comprised of many -- one of those of which we are members
23 of, and take the lead, and we're quite satisfied that
24 many of the benefits and efforts -- I think that we have
25 been listened to, and we've seen some good results

1 already, and I think that you'll hear more of that in the
2 next part, which a little bit overlaps in our
3 presentation.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Could I add to that?

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: Also what's happening
7 with this Port-to-Port Corridor Project and the Planning
8 Group that has come together, I think a lot of doors are
9 opening and we're giving -- being given a lot of
10 opportunity and there is a lot of co-operation.

11 So it's in its early stages, but if we all
12 work together the way it's been happening of late, I
13 think we can explore a lot of these opportunities and
14 work together.

15 If something isn't in place to make it
16 happen to maximize the economic benefits, then the will
17 seems to be there, and all the key stakeholders seem to
18 be willing to sit at the table and work it out. So I'm
19 very positive about that.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. My third and last
21 question, then I'll ask my colleagues, is with respect to
22 the plan, the Port-to-Port Corridor Planning Group that
23 you talked about.

24 Now, I realize that you're working on a
25 plan that's for a larger area than just the Tar Ponds and

1 the Coke Ovens lands. You listed the key stakeholders,
2 and then I was struck by the fact that you said that you
3 have -- that all the stakeholders, you have all the
4 stakeholders involved in this.

5 I was just wondering if you could reflect
6 on the context of the Tar Ponds and Cove Ovens Sites with
7 respect to their community situation, because they have
8 neighbouring communities, but have -- we've heard much
9 testimony, over the last couple of weeks, with respect to
10 the effects on the neighbourhoods around these lands of
11 the past industrial activities, and, indeed, of the Tar
12 Ponds legacy, and we've -- people have indicated that
13 they feel that these effects have been really very
14 significant in the past.

15 Do you think that -- how do you see
16 community concerns and aspirations, with respect to
17 future use of these lands, being incorporated into the
18 planning process?

19 It sounds like there's an economic
20 development planning process under way, with significant
21 implications to these plans, and, for all I know,
22 everyone may be perfectly happy with that as the main
23 direction.

24 But nevertheless, what role do the
25 communities have with respect to looking at future uses?

1 MR. FITZGERALD: I don't know if I have
2 the exact answer to give for that, but the CBRM is around
3 the table with us, and they have the elected
4 representatives from the different surrounding
5 communities.

6 I grew up in the community myself, not far
7 from the Coke Ovens and Tar Ponds. I think a lot of the
8 people that are there would understand well the needs and
9 the wants of the community, but we are very focused on
10 the economic future of our community, and this group is
11 very focused on -- there's very much a need for what is
12 going to be there after the Tar Ponds. Bruce.

13 MR. MALONEY: Thank you. I believe that
14 we're in that early stage. If we made it sound like
15 we're very far along in this plan, in the Port-to-Port, I
16 think that we are in the early stages. I believe that
17 there will be some more studying to do, maybe bringing in
18 somebody that can look at planning in the context of for
19 business and community living.

20 Obviously, we do not want to repeat, and
21 we must learn from, things that have gone on in the past,
22 so I don't think it will be all economic benefits or
23 economic part of this Port-to-Port. We will be very
24 aware of what the community will be.

25 Obviously, as my colleague stated, CBRM

1 are around that table, and are very much a part of what
2 we're talking about. There is nothing shy about any of
3 the councillors that sit on CBRM. They will make sure
4 that we are heard. And one other person that will make
5 sure that I'm sure it will be heard, and that would be
6 the mayor. He is very vocal and will speak, and I'm sure
7 that all parties concerned would have some say into what
8 we're going to do.

9 Our point was is that it needed to be put
10 together, somebody to lead it, somebody to lead it as a
11 group that could be viewed as maybe a little bit unbiased
12 in the sense that if we had -- in the past, we've had
13 many different groups, meaning the CBRM, the
14 municipality, the province would own land, there's just
15 too many stakeholders. We're trying to put it under one
16 roof, I guess, if that's the way to say it.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Can I add just another
18 point, just thinking this through, I think you're making
19 a good point, and I guess the issue is that I believe
20 this is the first time this group and this plan they're
21 working on has been spoken about publicly.

22 So we are, as you said, in the very early
23 stages, and maybe this is something that, as it becomes
24 more public, then we can invite more input, I'm sure we
25 will get more input.

1 So this is not something that we have any
2 answers to present right now, so I think the group would
3 be very open to consider other ways of gathering input.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Well thank you,
5 and I'm sure the panel may be pursuing this when CBRM
6 comes to make the presentation.

7 So I will now ask my colleagues.

8 MR. CHARLES: Gentlemen, in your
9 presentation, you state that many groups and experts are
10 studying the technical and environmental issues
11 surrounding the cleanup, and that you were willing to
12 trust their expertise.

13 Unfortunately, the experts don't always
14 agree on what should be done, so I'm not sure which
15 experts you're relying on. Are you talking about the
16 Dillon people who did your proposal? I'm trying to find
17 out where you stand on the project. Are you supportive
18 of any remediation, no matter what it is, as long as
19 something gets done? Or are you supporting the project
20 as defined?

21 MR. FITZGERALD: I think there's a lot of
22 weight on your committee that is here, and I don't have
23 any problem at all with this panel doing such an
24 exhaustive study, and I'm sure you will have some
25 guidance there, but I don't profess to be any expert on

1 that, but there is a proposal for a specific process in
2 cleanup that's presented, so I guess that's what we're
3 saying, go with it.

4 This has been studied for so long, and
5 many people have claimed this can work. Just today I've
6 heard people say "Well, encapsulation, there's down sides
7 to that, that may not work. You're leaving all this
8 stuff in the ground." And people are against
9 incineration.

10 When I was thinking of it, sitting in the
11 audience, I was thinking maybe that's exactly why they're
12 combining this, so that it's a little bit of each, and
13 reducing, trying to minimize the risk from both, and if
14 they have good technology and have done their research,
15 but -- I'm glad I'm not the one making the final
16 decision, but boy, we've got to get on with this.

17 MR. CHARLES: But you do have a
18 consultant's report that you, I presume, helped pay for,
19 the Dillon Group Consultants.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

21 MR. CHARLES: And you've read that report,
22 and they make certain observations about the project, and
23 so on. You're accepting that report, I take it, as
24 valid?

25 MR. MALONEY: We're accepting what Dillon

1 had said, but we're supporting what the proponent has
2 said for the cleanup.

3 MR. CHARLES: Okay. That's what I wanted
4 to establish, because we've had discussion this afternoon
5 about the silent majority, I just wanted to be sure you
6 weren't part of that silent majority. So I take it that
7 you're not.

8 MR. MALONEY: We haven't been very silent
9 when we said we would just like it cleaned up the safest
10 and most effective tried and true methods. The proponent
11 has presented those, and we have agreed with those, and
12 said we would support that.

13 MR. CHARLES: That's fine, thanks very
14 much.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right, I'll now invite
16 questions from other participants, and I'll turn to the
17 Tar Ponds Agency first, and ask if you have a couple of
18 questions, let's start with two questions.

19 -----

20 --- QUESTIONED BY THE SYDNEY TAR PONDS AGENCY:

21 (MR. FRANK POTTER)

22 MR. POTTER: Thank you, Madam Chair, Mr.
23 Maloney and Mr. Fitzgerald.

24 In your presentation, you said there was
25 always going to be some risks, and the greatest risk is

1 to do nothing, and you said you trust the engineering
2 work and the agency to do the job correctly, and safely,
3 and effectively.

4 I'd just like to ask you how can we, as an
5 agency, maintain that trust as the project moves ahead,
6 recognizing that there has to be some risks to the
7 project, whether it's traffic, transportation risks, or
8 risks of upset conditions, or dust, whatever it might be?
9 What would we have to do to help maintain that trust as
10 the project proceeds?

11 MR. FITZGERALD: As I made a transition in
12 my life, and at this later stage went back to school and
13 did some studies and just last year finished my MBA in
14 Community Economic Development, something I've learned
15 from that, and I guess learning as I get older, is
16 communication is awfully important, and keeping open the
17 dialogue really helps build trust. And a lot of that is
18 happening here, and you have to have more of that, maybe
19 it's as simple as that.

20 MR. MALONEY: If I also may say, that is
21 exactly what I was going to say. You have to be --
22 communicate very clearly what's happening, at all times,
23 keeping us informed. I believe if one thing that -- lots
24 of controversy over this whole issue from many different
25 groups, is that it's forced us to be very open. I think

1 the word "transparent" is there.

2 Communication is one of the biggest things
3 in anything that's going on today. If we do not
4 communicate clearly what's going to happen, then there'll
5 be problems. But I think that if you do communicate it
6 very clearly -- and I think that we should be allowed to
7 disagree, at times, without becoming disagreeable, and I
8 think that would be a very important aspect.

9 Your community liaison group needs to be
10 able to take the questions from the community and present
11 them to you very clearly, and you must react to them, and
12 I think that will be another key thing.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: If I can just add to
14 that, keep in mind that you will build that much more
15 trust, that even when something goes wrong, when the
16 students at Sydney Academy raise issues about "Do you
17 have plans? What if something went wrong?", be open
18 about that.

19 And when you're talking mechanical
20 processes and trucks moving, and all of this material, I
21 have no doubt you can't guarantee anyone absolutely
22 safety, or that everything will work absolutely the way
23 it's going to work. So when something doesn't, and
24 there's something escapes into the atmosphere or spills,
25 or whatever, if there's an openness right up front

1 quickly about that, telling people the facts, that will
2 also help build trust before it starts to turn into a
3 monster in the media that is ten times bigger than really
4 it was in reality. Just a thought.

5 MR. POTTER: Thank you, that's fine, Madam
6 Chair.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Potter.

8 Registered presenters, going first to
9 registered presenters, are there any with questions? Ms.
10 MacLellan. Just Ms. MacLellan. Would you like to come
11 forward, and two questions, please, or maximum of two.

12 -----

13 --- QUESTIONED BY CAPE BRETON SAVE OUR HEALTH CARE

14 (MS. MARY-RUTH MACLELLAN)

15 MS. MACLELLAN: Sorry, Madam Chair, I
16 wanted to -- I'm sorry if I have to ask questions of
17 everybody.

18 First to let them know, while they did not
19 necessarily want the full panel review, I lobbied long
20 and hard to get the full panel review, and when it looked
21 like it didn't -- wasn't going to fall into place, I
22 pulled at the minister's heart strings for a while. Two
23 days later, we had the full panel review.

24 My questions now. You spoke about the
25 stakeholders. Where do the people fit in in your list of

1 stakeholders that were there?

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: If I can just interrupt,
3 I guess that was the same question that I put to the
4 presenters, but I'll let you give an answer to that, as
5 well.

6 MR. MALONEY: I think the simple answer is
7 the CBRM, their representation in this, and that we are
8 open to other considerations.

9 MS. MACLELLAN: My next question, or just
10 one comment to that and then my next question. CBRM does
11 not want incineration. Are you aware of that?

12 MR. MALONEY: We're talking two different
13 things. What I was just speaking about has to do
14 specifically with planning for the future, and future
15 land use after this is all completed. So there's two
16 different ---

17 MS. MACLELLAN: So you weren't talking to
18 them about the process. Like if they represent the
19 people, and that's what you're using as representing the
20 people, were you talking to them specifically about the
21 land uses, or, indeed, the whole process?

22 MR. MALONEY: When we mentioned in our
23 report that we were talking about the stakeholders, CBRM
24 is a stakeholder around our Port-to-Port, and they would
25 represent that.

1 The report we presented here today is
2 strictly a report on behalf of the business community
3 that we represent.

4 MS. MACLELLAN: Thank you. My next
5 question, before you decided to go with this technology,
6 did you study the possible health impacts on people, and
7 do any research on the use of incinerators anywhere else
8 around the world?

9 MR. FITZGERALD: One of the things that we
10 trust in the role of business is to trust people that we
11 consult with.

12 There was a multitude of consultants
13 brought in, and experts, and we're involved in that. We
14 chatted and talked, had briefings on every aspect of the
15 health part of it, and we still felt that the experts
16 were saying, very clearly, that all parts of this could
17 be done safely, and with a measure of low risk, and we
18 felt comfortable with that. And, at some point, you have
19 to trust what they are.

20 I am not an expert in any of this cleanup
21 so I have to take what we're told and we talk about it
22 and make a decision, and that's how we came to our
23 conclusion on it.

24 I would believe that we would go and, at
25 the end of the day, we still felt strongly that whatever

1 they would decide we went with.

2 And the same thing would stand true with
3 this panel hearing, whatever this full panel would
4 recommend to the government of the day, we would have to
5 stand with that, as long as we end up having a cleanup
6 being done.

7 MS. MACLELLAN: So essentially what you're
8 saying is that you went with what you were presented, and
9 you didn't do any research or you didn't look at any
10 other alternate technologies. Just yes or no will do.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: We have members within
12 our group that would take and listen to what the experts
13 said, we'll take what the experts told us and that's what
14 we listened to.

15 MS. MACLELLAN: So you're just looking at
16 this merely from an economic boom. Thank you very much,
17 Madam Chair.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: I'd like to say
19 personally that -- and I don't think I would be the only
20 one, but as a business person, I did attend some of these
21 different sessions over the years, and read
22 documentation, filled out the work books and trying to
23 assess, just like a lot of people in our community, as
24 best we could of how we should move forward.

25 So a lot of people in both the business

1 community and not in the business community, or young
2 people, have tried their best to sort of make themselves
3 aware of the facts, ask as many questions, attend
4 workshops, but it's hard for most of us to attend every
5 one of these, it's very difficult, but yes, there has to
6 be some trust in the end, and accept some of the
7 recommendations.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you.

9 Is there anybody who is not a registered
10 presenter who has a question for the Chamber?

11 As there isn't anybody else, I'd like to
12 thank you both very much for your presentation, and --
13 did you want to say something more?

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Can I ask myself a
15 question, and answer it, because I anticipated the panel
16 was going to ask a couple of questions earlier that I
17 thought were very relevant to our plan, and I'd just like
18 to make sure it's on the record of what we think of it.
19 Is that proper?

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, I guess. I guess
21 if we didn't do it, you'd better do it.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: The reference -- the
23 question was asked earlier of all of the other industrial
24 lands, what do we call them, industrial parks that are
25 around, I don't know what the reference was, how many

1 there were.

2 The key point here is the positioning of
3 these very strategic lands, and how they tie into the
4 four key methods or modes of transportation. So there's
5 a very important difference here and what we're talking
6 about in these lands as opposed to Cosset Heights
7 Industrial Park, which there's almost no access to, and
8 everybody knows that's why it hasn't really been that
9 successful.

10 So I think that's an important point to
11 make on the record.

12 And then, as far as a question on the
13 capping restrictions, again I don't profess to be an
14 expert on this, but I thought that's a good point, and
15 maybe we have to learn more through our research and our
16 study that this group, this Port-to-Port Corridor will
17 have to get more information on this, but again we're not
18 just talking Tar Ponds land.

19 What's happening here in our economy,
20 we've had some very dramatic changes to do with SYSCO and
21 DEVCO. The Tar Ponds is part of it, it's left a huge
22 legacy, an awful mess for us. Granted, we're going to
23 deal with that, soon, right.

24 But these lands that we have, what you're
25 going to cap, I'm assuming -- maybe I can -- can I ask

1 questions of the agency, these lands -- my impression is
2 it's a small percentage of lands that are going to be
3 capped, so there'll still be lots of land that we can
4 explore other more aggressive or more imaginative or
5 creative uses of. There may be some restriction where
6 it's actually capped, but I don't think that's
7 handcuffing us totally, is that fair to say?

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I will just get
9 the agency to give a very brief clarification of how much
10 of the whole of the Tar Ponds will be capped, and if you
11 could perhaps give a percentage figure for how much of
12 the Coke Ovens Site will be capped.

13 MR. POTTER: Thank you. The Coke Ovens,
14 the capping is roughly going to be probably 60 percent of
15 the acreage, I guess, of the Coke Ovens Site, and we have
16 talked about this before, you know, that's to take it to
17 the point where we identified its future use currently as
18 light industrial commercial use.

19 There is opportunity for that use to be
20 increased, probably depending on the outcome of some of
21 these issues that you've talked about with, you know, the
22 planning for the site, and with very minimal effort and
23 not too much money, there could be additional capping,
24 additional work done to, you know, make the land more
25 suitable for other uses that are above that industrial

1 commercial activity.

2

3

--- QUESTIONED BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL:

4

MR. CHARLES: Madam Chair, I'd just like
5 to make one comment.

6

7

I was the one that asked the question
about the lands, and your son down there gave me a very
8 good answer, so I didn't see any need to ask you.

9

MR. FITZGERALD: I've been put in my spot.

10

11

DR. LAPIERRE: I would just like to have a
question or a comment onto your last question. It's a
12 concern that I have also because when I look at the
13 bearing capacity of what the Tar Ponds are going to be,
14 and the answer you just received it's 100 percent of the
15 Tar Ponds that's going to be capped, it's 60 percent of
16 the Coke Ovens that's going to be capped, it's a
17 significant amount of that land.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if that land is going to be capped to
a -- with a burden, a low -- what I would classify as a
very low burden, what you're going to do -- sure, you can
develop that land, you could have walking trails, like I
think your son indicated that would be an interest, but
if I listen to your presentation you seem to have some
other interests other than just walking trails for those
areas.

1 And as you move along and develop that
2 land, sure you can engineer processes down the road which
3 will enable you to build, and we've heard from the Tar
4 Ponds Agency how that could take place, but if you look
5 at the structure that's going to be in place, it's a very
6 complex structure. It has a drainage system that you
7 can't go fiddle with and just stop it, otherwise why have
8 it. So you have a very complex drainage system, you have
9 a very efficient and supposedly a cap that is there to
10 stop water from going into the monolith.

11 If you have all of these structures, and
12 you have a minimum cover, and then if you're going to
13 build on that, you're going to have to increase the
14 bearing capacity.

15 My concern is that if you're preparing
16 your land to have, as you indicated in your slide, a
17 prime -- the premier of North America, why wouldn't you
18 want to enhance that bearing capacity so it enhances your
19 capability of what you can do with the land down the
20 road, rather than having a costly second engineering in
21 place, or secondary engineering processes, to get your
22 buildings in place, or your industrial development. And
23 that's the question I had, and I asked the person before
24 you, and he gave me an answer. I didn't ask you this
25 time, but it's a concern that I have with the project,

1 and I'd like to know if you have any with it.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, the main point I
3 guess I want to make is that your mandate is to deal with
4 the Tar Pond and Coke Ovens, that issue. That's not our
5 mandate. That's only part of the puzzle for us, because
6 there are still SYSCO lands, DEVCO lands, other than the
7 Tar Ponds, and we have to come up with the vision and the
8 model that can sort of explore the opportunities with all
9 of this.

10 So that's why the Port-to-Port Corridor
11 and it's not just the Tar Ponds -- future development of
12 the Tar Ponds land. That's not what we are just
13 studying.

14 So we have to figure out what can be done
15 with the Tar Ponds land, but what opportunities are
16 presented by the neighbouring lands that maybe you have
17 to have access roads through the Tar Pond lands to open
18 up these other lands. That's the sort of thing we're
19 trying to explore.

20 DR. LAPIERRE: Well, that would be just
21 one point, for example, access road through it. If
22 you're going to build a road, and you go one meter of
23 soil, or a meter plus on top of your cap, which is a very
24 extensive system of drainage, then you either have to put
25 a very extensive over-burden to put in your road system,

1 which may be something you might want to think about
2 prior to starting the project. I think it would be
3 cheaper to do it now than to do it down the road.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: I have just one quick
5 question. Does your Port-to-Port include the VJ site?

6 MR. FITZGERALD: It goes through that area
7 or around it, but I don't think that is specifically
8 defined yet. As part of the study and the research,
9 we'll have to figure out how we make that work and what's
10 even available, and who owns what land there. I don't
11 know if that's all totally defined.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right.

13 Well, thank you very much, thank you for
14 your presentation.

15 We will now take a 5-minute break, and we
16 will resume with the Cape Breton Partnership.

17

18 --- RECESS AT 4:02 P.M.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

--- RESUME AT 4:07 P.M.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Ladies and gentlemen, if we could resume. Our next presenters are from the Cape Breton Partnership. Well, welcome back Mr. Maloney, Mr. MacDonald and your colleague, who I'm afraid I don't know yet but I'm sure he will introduce himself and so as you know you have a 40 minutes limit on your presentation and we look forward to hearing it.

MR. MACDONALD: Thank you, again. Again, I'm Keith MacDonald. And I'm representing the Cape Breton Partnership as general manager. And with me I have -- I'll let them introduce -- Pat Bates will introduce himself.

MR. BATES: Yes, my name is Pat Bates. And I'm a retired Federal Public Servant. I'm resident in Sydney and a member of the action team that Mr. MacDonald's going to speak to.

MR. MALONEY: And although I was in another capacity as past president of the chamber, my current job is president and CEO of the Cape Breton Partnership.

--- PRESENTATION BY CAPE BRETON PARTNERSHIP
(MR. KEITH MACDONALD)

1 MR. MACDONALD: So this afternoon we are
2 going to go over the Partnership background, the Economic
3 Benefits Action Team overview. Then we're going to talk
4 about the economic benefit strategy that we've been
5 proposing, go forward and a little bit about one of our
6 mandates, an organization which is Branding Cape Breton.

7 As a backdrop to the Cape Breton
8 Partnership, I wanted to give you some background to our
9 organization. Basically in 2003 there is an image study
10 conducted on Cape Breton which was conducted in Toronto,
11 Ottawa, Halifax and Sydney. We wanted to basically get a
12 better understanding of the perception of Cape Breton in
13 other areas of the country. We wanted to determine the
14 overall impressions of Cape Breton as a place to invest
15 and do business and to understand how the image was
16 impacting investment and growth opportunities.

17 The research showed that progress
18 continues to be impaired by some long-standing
19 negativities. Some of these negative perceptions and
20 some of the positive ones that are listed here, usual
21 descriptors that were used in these survey sessions such
22 as beautiful, scenic, friendly, music and culture were
23 all related to positive attributes of Cape Breton. But
24 equally noted were the loss of coal and steel, dominant
25 unions, high unemployment, political dealings and the Tar

1 Ponds project as a significant environmental challenge.

2 Also mentioned was the high occurrence of
3 strikes and industrial action. We can all appreciate how
4 these labels impact our ability to move forward and
5 create positive change. Therefore an organization was
6 developed, the Cape Breton Partnership which was a
7 collaborative effort of a number of organizations. We
8 had business, large and small, industry associations,
9 Chambers of Commerce, youth, First Nations and the
10 education community all participating. Was established
11 over a year ago modelled on other successful partnerships
12 as the Halifax Greater Partnership and broadly
13 representative of the Cape Breton private sector.

14 In March, 2005 the Cape Breton Partnership
15 held a vision session to seek the input of public and
16 private sector leaders with regard to priority areas.
17 The 125 delegates defined very clear goals and objectives
18 for the Cape Breton Partnership. Our purpose was
19 developed which is to instill ownership, confidence and
20 pride to enhance prosperity in the Cape Breton and Strait
21 region.

22 Our mandate and vision for our
23 organization is that we are working towards increasing
24 economic prosperity by immobilizing private sector
25 energy, expertise and resources. And our mandate is to

1 build a progressive image through collaboration that
2 reflects the strengths of the region, increases business
3 confidence and ability to compete in global markets.

4 To that end we've come up with four
5 strategic goals. These are also defined by the private
6 sector and we believe that a key to ensuring further
7 growth and development for our economy and they are
8 currently not being serviced by any other organizations
9 so that we do not create overlap. So we are working
10 together on an island-wide basis with other agencies to
11 promote a unique brand for Cape Breton, develop a united
12 approach to addressing economic issues and growth
13 opportunities, to encourage the retention and expansion
14 of existing companies in identifying barriers to find --
15 or identifying barriers and finding ways to remove them
16 and to create a dynamic organization that will foster
17 private and public sector confidence in the Cape Breton
18 partnership.

19 With this in mind we came up with a
20 strategic context of the -- within the strategic context
21 of economic opportunities and challenges, two action
22 teams were evolved. One was the Economic Benefits Action
23 Team which concerned itself with the four hundred million
24 dollar (\$400,000,000) Tar Ponds cleanup and also the
25 Sydney Airport Action Team which addressed challenges to

1 future air services.

2 The Economic Benefits Action Team as a
3 brief overview, grew out of a Cape Breton Growth Fund
4 initiative which a number of the members were previously
5 involved in which was a group that was put together to
6 look at opportunities in the economic remediation
7 industry and how to build capacity within it.

8 It moved from the Cape Breton Growth Fund
9 to the Cape Breton Partnership and currently has 37 -- is
10 made up of 37 organizations. It's broadly representative
11 of Cape Breton's private sector. It's developed a small
12 body of research on benefits. It represents several
13 thousand hours of volunteer input.

14 The Action Team believes the economy is
15 rebounding following closure of the coal and steel
16 industries but unemployment remains unacceptably high.
17 Average household income trails the provincial average
18 and businesses per capita are the lowest of the four
19 provincial regions. The Economic Benefits Action Team
20 has two common objectives. Or believes there's two
21 common objectives. One is that by any measure the
22 cleanup is of a significant undertaking and it's a once
23 in a lifetime opportunity. In fact, we believe that
24 optimization of economic impacts are of critical
25 importance to the future of the area.

1 The committees came up with three areas of
2 economic impact. Firstly, it's business climate
3 attraction of incremental direct foreign investment. No.
4 2 is personal years of employment and incremental
5 household income. And thirdly is sustainable new
6 business and wealth generation through new income.

7 The desired outcomes of the committee are
8 to use -- so that the use of Cape Breton labour, products
9 and services are maximized throughout the completion of
10 the project, that there's an engagement of local
11 companies to participate, that there's a transfer of
12 skills and capacity enhancement through various means
13 including partnerships. And that content stipulations
14 for off island firms be established. And lastly a
15 sustainable business legacy is left after the completion
16 of the project.

17 Some progress to date, we have some
18 fundamental building blocks for the committee. We have
19 an action team that has industry collaboration. We're at
20 the table all working together for a common goal. We
21 have a Statement of Intentions and Benefits from the
22 STPA. And we have open communication lines within
23 various different stakeholders and organizations to move
24 forward. As resources we can actively work with the
25 benefits officer at the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency. We have

1 capacity within the Cape Breton Partnership to move
2 economic benefits frame work forward. And we have the
3 industry contributing to our organization in the cost
4 sharing method so that we can build research and
5 planning.

6 Already we've undertaken some key studies.
7 We've done community consultation and helped -- and hope
8 to move forward and plan on moving forward with some
9 workshops and other activities that'll be outlined in
10 some upcoming slides. All of these activities will move
11 towards a functional benefits frame work. Within this
12 frame work we hope to see contract packages, content
13 targeting and wading. We would like to see content and
14 tracking and measurement. And key policies and criteria
15 developed on the economic benefits front.

16 The EBAT team, the Economic Benefits
17 Action Team has been working with the STPA to move
18 forward some activities. Some of the additional
19 activities that we felt of note to address today or
20 highlight is the creation of an on-line business
21 directory that has been one step taken by the STPA to
22 optimize results. The on-line business directory has
23 been developed to facilitate communication between local
24 and off-island firms which is predicted to play a role in
25 awarding of future contracts.

1 Also the STPA has put in some criteria on
2 economic benefits within requests for proposal bids. And
3 additionally they've commissioned a business and labour
4 capacity study which is underway to discover gaps within
5 the local business capacity as well as in the local
6 labour market requirement -- capacity, sorry, within the
7 local community that will be able to engage in the
8 process of cleaning up the Tar Ponds project and Coke
9 Oven site.

10 The executive activities which have been
11 ongoing, there's been meetings and communications with
12 key stakeholders including the STPA staff and senior
13 management. We've dialogued on strategy. We've
14 presented to the Canada/Nova Scotia project management
15 team regarding the number of key initiatives that we
16 would like to see moved forward, that are listed there.
17 One of the important aspects that we had been moving
18 towards is a shared decision-making on specific policies
19 and select initiatives.

20 Also the Economic Benefits Action Team has
21 submitted a proposal to the STPA on a number -- moving
22 forward a number of key activities which we feel are
23 important such as capacity building workshops, developing
24 partnerships and alliances, opening the possibility of
25 additional local companies teaming up with companies from

1 away or a number of local companies teaming up here to
2 form new conglomerates to address business gaps. We also
3 are looking at an economic benefits model and we want to
4 continue to liaison and monitoring aspect of economic
5 benefits.

6 Also the executive has recently invited
7 the three project teams that are bidding on the final
8 engineering design to dialogue regarding economic
9 benefits. There's also ongoing feedback from the
10 committee on moving forward and developing new
11 strategies. The team feels that we have a future role to
12 play within the economic benefits frame work and we'd
13 like to see that continue to move forward. We would like
14 to continue communicating and promoting the importance of
15 optimizing economic benefits.

16 We would like to put together some key
17 strategic initiatives such as a think tank which would
18 develop new programs and support initiatives for the
19 project. We'd like to be engaged in monitoring of
20 localized benefits, planning further workshops and
21 information centre sessions. Be involved in land end use
22 planning. Create an economic benefits model, liaison
23 with the STP and Federal departments and their
24 representatives as the project moves forward.

25 We want to clearly demonstrate to the

1 community and to the project management team that the
2 optimization of local benefits is an important issue for
3 the Cape Breton private sector which must be effectively
4 addressed. As we move forward on building a benefits
5 model we feel that it's inherently challenging and will
6 require the commitment from key stakeholders, new
7 resources and collaboration from various parties to move
8 this forward.

9 To move forward the -- or our organization
10 feels that the working relationship on economic benefits
11 can be made more productive in the future. We feel that
12 the Economic Benefits Team can interact with the final
13 design engineer and the STPA in the hopes that as we move
14 forward in addressing economic benefits that we have an
15 open dialogue and that we are putting key strategies in
16 place to move the issue forward.

17 For example, we could look at program
18 funding and capacity building. Again, knowledge transfer
19 and partnership development. EBAT is an advisory role to
20 the various management teams and shared decision-making
21 on specific policies and select initiatives. Now that
22 completes our presentation regarding the -- our
23 activities with the Economic Benefits Action Team.

24 And now I'm going to move into a second
25 section of the Partnership's involvement in the -- or

1 concerns we have with the overall project that fits
2 within our overall mandate. As I talked before or I
3 spoke before in the presentation, one our key strategic
4 mandates is our Branding initiative.

5 Branding builds the confidence and pride
6 in a product and provides a positive image on our
7 product. And we're able to tell stories about that
8 product that we can deliver to other key areas of the
9 community. We feel this is an important aspect in moving
10 the private sector forward in Cape Breton. It is
11 important to clarify that Brand is more than a few
12 pictures or a catchy phrase.

13 A Brand is a reflection of the qualities
14 and attributes of a product that are valuable to a
15 consumer. The Brand can also build confidence and pride,
16 improve morale and creates a sense of identity. And in
17 this case the product is the Cape Breton and Strait
18 Region. Branding can also help reposition Cape Breton to
19 move forward. And we feel the Tar Ponds project is a key
20 hindrance to that ability to move forward.

21 Research indicates that approximately 60
22 percent of GDP in the province is represented by consumer
23 spending and that's by spending is attributed to
24 perceptions we have about our present and future economic
25 well-being. When consumers are confident they spend and

1 when they spend business invests. Research also shows
2 that confident business communities invest, attract and
3 retains talented people and builds international
4 relationships.

5 We feel that by reversing the negative
6 stigma attached to the island as a result of the Tar
7 Ponds project is a priority for the Cape Breton
8 Partnership. The completion of the cleanup is a -- in a
9 timely and safe manner allows the Cape Breton Partnership
10 to move forward effectively to market this community to
11 potential investors. Potential investors, employees and
12 retirees have been concerned for the health of their
13 community employees due to the fears of the Tar Ponds.

14 As you have been presented in one of your
15 previous Panel sessions with CEO John Malcolm who's now
16 in -- working for the Capital Health District, has been
17 seconded to that area. He usually relates this problem
18 to pulling in some key professionals to his organization.
19 And at times some of them are detracted from coming to
20 the area just because of the concept of the Tar Ponds
21 being within their community.

22 It is important to the Cape Breton
23 Partnership that the cleanup move forward so that the
24 organization can contribute to promote Cape Breton as a
25 place to live and do business safely. The effective

1 cleanup of the Tar Ponds and Coke Oven site will ensure
2 that business and consumer confidence will be positively
3 impacted. It will demonstrate that large scale
4 environmental remediation projects can be successfully
5 undertaken on Cape Breton.

6 It will provide numerous opportunities for
7 new positive marketing initiatives. It will also allow
8 for the metro Cape Breton area to build a new brand that
9 represents a new area of growth and opportunity. And
10 also to increase Cape Breton's rating as a travel
11 destination. That is the end of the formal presentation.
12 We -- and some of my colleagues here will make some
13 follow-up comments.

14 MR. BATES: Thank you very much, Madam
15 Chair, members of the Panel for permitting me to join the
16 group and make a couple of observations. Just a quick
17 comment on the history of economic benefits certainly as
18 I've come to understand them. And this phenomena grew
19 out of the defense industry, defense expenditures going
20 back about 30 years. And my recollection over the first
21 action and the first profile allotted to this activity
22 was through defense spending on the purchase of the CF-18
23 fighters from MacDonalld Douglas and this will go back to
24 the late 70's and early 80's or thereabouts.

25 And the governments of the day took the

1 position that these were major expenditures and to the
2 extent that they would occur in parts of the country
3 where specific economic development programming was
4 already underway that the additional defense expenditures
5 could be levered. Could assist in building the capacity
6 in these various communities. It wasn't long after that
7 that we had the experience with the frigate program that
8 was managed by Saint John Shipbuilding and Drydock and it
9 was shared with the shipbuilders in Libby, Quebec I think
10 and some others but very major expenditures that were
11 directed in the form of economic benefits beyond the
12 objectives of procurement for the ships and the aircraft.

13 In the non-defense area, we've had some
14 experience more recent years, certainly with the Hibernia
15 field in Newfoundland, major government expenditures in
16 the form of investment in that particular case. And a
17 very high level of effort was supplied to extracting as
18 best they could economic benefits from those
19 expenditures. And certainly the construction of the
20 offshore oil rig at -- like that I think epitomized how
21 that went forward.

22 More recently we've all had -- I shouldn't
23 say we've all, but many of us had some direct experience
24 with the Strait Crossing. A major expenditure with the
25 Federal investment being shifted from the operation on

1 the ferries to the construction of the bridge. These
2 actions demonstrated how important and how effective
3 focused government expenditures can be in a particular
4 community.

5 I would hold the view that that is the
6 case here, looking at the anticipated amount of money
7 that would go into this particular project when all the
8 approvals have been agreed to and granted. We think that
9 the economic benefits component has to be an integrated
10 part of this expenditure. I think it's unfortunate
11 sometimes that the effort to try and extract some
12 benefits are seen as a distraction to the main focus
13 which is health. And I don't think anybody disagrees
14 that health has to be in and sequentially would be the
15 first order of priority.

16 Having said that, those of us who live
17 here, enjoy living here, want to sustain this community
18 and Keith has referenced capacity building many times,
19 are anxious to see that this can be done in a way that
20 there is a positive legacy left here for those of us who
21 are going to live here and try and re-establish the
22 community back to some suitable standards of quality of
23 life. And we think that's possible. The efforts will
24 have to be focused and they'll have to be agreed to by
25 all of the participants but in my judgment I think it's a

1 very noble effort.

2 My final comment I think has to do with
3 the idea of creation of employment. Cape Breton has had
4 government operations, major operations in steel and coal
5 for a long time, not with a great history. So
6 consequently our part of the province has to rely like
7 the rest of the Atlantic, on the private sector to
8 generate the economic wealth we expect to have here. So
9 consequently if we can lever some of these expenditures
10 and if we could plead to you people to see the value in
11 economic benefits and convey your sentiments in that
12 degree to Sydney Tar Ponds Agency, we think that would
13 help.

14 But I do think it's also fair to credit
15 the agency for some of the good stuffs they have taken.
16 They certainly have been looking at cooperating. You
17 have some tangible things and I think we want to applaud
18 them for that. Thank you, Madam Chair, that's my
19 remarks.

20 MR. MALONEY: There's not much more that I
21 can add after these two gentlemen. Pat Bates has been a
22 key part of this EBAT committee. It is an action team.
23 We really would like to very much at the end of the day,
24 have a legacy of good business here with the
25 environmental firms that are here, the engineering teams

1 and firms. If they can grow so that we can end up
2 becoming the experts in some other field down the road.
3 That would be our main focus is to build that economic
4 base here in Cape Breton using Cape Breton people and
5 businesses.

6 I think the Tar Ponds Agency has been good
7 at listening and we have felt some of that -- some
8 success to that extent already and I think that if they
9 continue to be open minded and listening we should
10 continue to grow and this will be a wonderful boom to
11 this area. You know, this is a huge, huge project. A
12 lot of money is being spent here over the next number of
13 years and we want to make sure that we do it in the --
14 for the most part correct.

15 And so that's why you have a lot of people
16 that are involved in it and that's probably why you see
17 some of the same faces appearing before you because we're
18 passionate that it gets done and so that's the -- that's
19 why you're seeing some overlap here. So I can't add much
20 more to that.

21 -----

22 THE CAPE BRETON PARTNERSHIP

23 --- QUESTIONED BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. MacDonald, Mr.
25 Bates, Mr. Maloney, thank you very much for your

1 presentation. I guess I have two questions, one which is
2 probably easy and one which is bringing in a new subject,
3 whether you find it easy or not. My first question is
4 around the comment about aiming for a sustainable
5 business legacy. So in other words when the remediation
6 is complete you've got some new businesses, some enhanced
7 businesses that will go forward. I just wonder if you
8 have some more comments or ideas about what types of --
9 are you looking at some new types of businesses and do
10 you know how they'll -- what are going to be the key
11 factors ensuring that they are, in fact, sustainable?

12 MR. MACDONALD: We think when the key
13 initiatives that will play a major part in identifying
14 business opportunities will be the study that's just been
15 underway by the STPA in identifying business gaps. What
16 they're doing is analyzing the overall project and
17 reviewing what type of material, what type of activities
18 will be undergoing throughout the course of the project
19 and discovering if indeed the Cape Breton business
20 community has the capacity to take on certain -- all of
21 these aspects of the project.

22 Once that study's completed the Economic
23 Benefits Action Team would like to have a workshop where
24 we bring the private sector of the island together to
25 discuss these gaps and look at opportunities to create

1 new business functions, to collaborate amongst each other
2 to address these gaps in the business capacity. And that
3 could be from -- anywhere from, you know, large scale
4 marketing initiatives to as we all know, major earth
5 moving type of activities that'll be underway throughout
6 the course of the project.

7 In the dialog regarding sustainability one
8 of the discussions that's been taking place is that once
9 the project is completed we will have a number of various
10 sectors that will have built a great deal of capacity and
11 that we want to be able to utilize that capacity in the
12 future. We don't want to see that the project's underway
13 and then after the project's completed that we have all
14 of these new people or these individuals leaving the area
15 with this capacity that they've built up over the years
16 of the project.

17 What we'd like to see is possibly some
18 type of business capacity built here that we can utilize
19 the companies locally to work in export markets, possibly
20 utilize on other long-term remediation projects
21 throughout the nation such as the funding that was
22 announced for the remediation projects for the most part
23 that are taking place in North of 60. So that we can see
24 that there's opportunities in the future. There's other
25 opportunities we think to create collaboratives that can

1 -- that want for the most part after the completion of
2 the project, remain in the community to look at other
3 business opportunities in the -- at a regional level now
4 that we have this new capacity built.

5 MR. BATES: Just a word in addition to
6 Keith's remarks. I don't think any of us are holding out
7 the remediation of the Sydney Tar Ponds as a panacea.
8 But we do see it as an integrated approach in the
9 business that we're in in terms of economic development.
10 For example there are some firms in Cape Breton now who
11 very quietly are manufacturing and they're shipping their
12 product and they're shipping their technology out of the
13 province and in some instances out of the country.
14 They're challenged by many of the same problems that Mr.
15 Malcolm would have and the university would have in
16 attracting professional people for some of the reasons
17 that maybe Dr. MacCormick mentioned in his presentation
18 the other evening.

19 The area has a fast growing cultural
20 industry. We have a good quality of life. We think that
21 a combination of these things will work to the advantage
22 of being able to satisfy some of the people that want to
23 develop knowledge based industries here on the basis of
24 what we've experienced. There's a cliché, I guess, in
25 the economic development business that if we could hold

1 all of the variables constant, you see while we're fixing
2 some of the difficult ones that our lives would be easy.

3 None of our lives are easy but constantly
4 if we can create a universe where we have some of these
5 things in animated suspension if I could use that phrase
6 while we're correcting things like the Tar Ponds
7 situation and creating a better atmosphere for employees
8 to come then we think that we've made some major
9 accomplishments. So with all of the other things plus
10 the Tar Ponds we are on the road to some good success.
11 Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you. Here's
13 my second question and I think it's a question that also
14 I may need to direct to the agency but we're talking
15 about socio-economic benefits here. And local benefits.
16 And I'm curious to know whether you've given any thoughts
17 to the participation of women in this project, especially
18 in terms of employment? Because this is going to be a
19 very large project, lasting a very long time. It's going
20 to be -- involve a lot of trades that are -- typically do
21 not currently employ many women.

22 And in -- when there have been other large
23 projects, especially ones that have involved a lot of
24 public funding and this is all public funding, there
25 often are requirements for there to be some proactive

1 steps taken to make sure that women have better -- have
2 more opportunities, more employment opportunities
3 including, you know, proactive training in the non-
4 traditional occupations. So have you given this any
5 thought and then when you've answered that I'm going to
6 turn around and ask the Agency if they've given this any
7 thought.

8 MR. MACDONALD: Within that study that I
9 mentioned there, the business capacity study, there's
10 also a component which is the labour market study. So
11 what the STPA will be doing is analyzing the current
12 labour market then also the second phase will be
13 analyzing the overall project component to find out what
14 type of labour requirements are going to be needed and
15 the third component is, again, identifying the gaps. So
16 after this is completed we should have a wholesale list
17 of opportunities there are for various different type of
18 employment levels within the project.

19 Once that's completed I could see
20 organizations such as Nova Scotia Community College who
21 has been very pro-active with their two campuses here in
22 Cape Breton, one out at the Marconi campus here on Grand
23 Lake Road as well as their campus in the Strait area to
24 approach women and get them involved in trades and
25 technology type of positions. I could see a kind of a

1 partnership with various organizations that will come
2 together to address the gaps. And one of the key
3 initiatives will be training, re-training and training
4 upgrading for these new employment opportunities. And I
5 would hope during that process that that would be one of
6 the key -- one of the significant areas that could be
7 examined is the ability of women to participate in the
8 cleanup at a more substantial level than would otherwise
9 take place if this isn't analyzed.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, that sounds great.
11 Just a comment, it would be good, you're going to
12 incorporate some gender analysis when you do the labour
13 market study, would that be right?

14 MR. MACDONALD: That's a project underway
15 by the STPA. They do have a steering committee for that
16 project and that's something the full Panel, I'm sure can
17 recommend but also the members of the STPA which -- or
18 sorry, the committee, the steering committee for that
19 project which includes a representative from the Nova
20 Scotia Community College. I'm sure we'll push that
21 forward.

22 MR. BATES: If I could, just to comment,
23 Madam Chair. I don't want to disagree with my colleague
24 at all. He has, I think, correctly outlined the approach
25 to the idea of doing a better job but I have to admit in

1 all honesty, I don't think we've had the level of
2 awareness of women that we need. I think we'd be
3 dishonest to go away letting you think that we made a
4 good job on that. Outside of the fact that I think we
5 have to admit that Sydney Tar Ponds have engaged an
6 excellent female who is directing the Economic Benefits
7 Program for this particular exercise. So we have to take
8 our hat off to that particular initiative.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, one's good, I
10 guess. It's a start. No, but Mr. Potter, could you just
11 -- would you like to comment on this?

12 MR. POTTER: Certainly thank you. As the
13 Partnership members mentioned the -- we are doing the
14 business capacity study and we will be looking at that
15 aspect. We recognize that the, you know, to ensure that
16 we are maximizing all minorities in this project as we
17 move ahead, you have to put incentives in place to make
18 sure that happens. The approach that we've taken is that
19 we've built into our tendering process a -- like I
20 believe we've explained this before, we have a 15 point
21 scoring basis for all contracts from -- whether it's
22 engineering services to contractors bidding on
23 construction work, they have to demonstrate a number of
24 activities that they're doing to maximize local benefits,
25 one of which is employment which also includes

1 affirmative action.

2 So whether that be a minority or a, you
3 know, women in the work force, that there's -- there are
4 values assigned to that in the tender review process to
5 make sure that that does happen. We have built into the
6 tender evaluation and the tender monitoring aspect that
7 will ensure that the -- if a contractor or a firm
8 identifies that they are addressing that particular point
9 we'll be ensuring that we do -- we can actually enforce
10 and police that activity.

11 So we are trying to -- I think we
12 recognize that you have to force that to happen. We're
13 going to encourage it both in terms of that the business
14 capacity study that we're looking at if we can identify
15 ways of training and encouraging women to get into the
16 work force on this project, we're going to do that. And
17 I think we demonstrate that in our own work force at the
18 Agency. Three of our senior management team are females,
19 besides our Economic Benefits Coordinator, our Director
20 of Engineering, a non-female traditional engineering role
21 is held by a female as well as our office manager/HR
22 person.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you. I mean,
24 I'm well aware that women have made a lot of progress in
25 engineering fields but I still wanted to make the point

1 that there's going to be large numbers of -- a lot of
2 employment in the trades and heavy equipment in which
3 women generally have been much less active. So anyway,
4 we may pursue that later. Thank you very much.

5 DR. LAPIERRE: Thanks a lot for the
6 presentation. In the presentation you indicated that on
7 one of your slides that there would be -- I think it's
8 the third before the last, you indicate an issue of
9 program funding for capacity building and program. Was I
10 -- were we to understand that that funding would come
11 from the Sydney Tar Pond Agency?

12 MR. MACDONALD: I'll have to be corrected
13 on the name. There's a -- I think there's a fund
14 associated with the overall project. I can't think of
15 the name -- the correct term of the fund that we would be
16 seeking the funding for for those activities and I'd have
17 to -- Ken Swain would know and he's here or some of the
18 Tar Ponds Agency members would know the ---

19 DR. LAPIERRE: But I guess you are looking
20 towards a special fund that would be dedicated to
21 capacity building, knowledge training and partnership
22 development. Is that what that slide read?

23 MR. MACDONALD: This wouldn't be a
24 separate fund. This would be a -- it's just activities
25 that we would be applying to an already existing funding

1 mechanism that's available. I'm just not clear on -- I
2 just for -- I wouldn't want to miss ---

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: I believe Mr. Potter has
4 the -- do you have the name or you can explain what the
5 fund is?

6 MR. POTTER: There we go. Yes, it's the
7 community engagement fund. There's been allocation of
8 money in the overall budget set aside for a very wide
9 variety of engagement activities within the community.
10 Mr. Callahan from Sydney Academy actually came on
11 secondment to the Agency for six months to help develop
12 that environmental science program that was prepared at
13 Sydney Academy. We assisted in funding the school for
14 having him come out of the -- out of that school system
15 for six months. And we've done some other initiatives
16 but there's about two and a half million dollars
17 (\$2,500,000) allocated to community engagement over the
18 course of the project.

19 MR. CHARLES: In the presentation you made
20 some reference to the project teams that are going to be
21 bidding on the final design. And I don't know, I can't
22 recall whether you said you had been in consultation with
23 them or were going to be in consultation with them. My
24 question is, do you know the names or the identity of
25 these three teams?

1 MR. MACDONALD: If memory serves me
2 correct, the lead proponents for each one are -- I think
3 this is public, correct? Maybe not -- is AMEC, SNC
4 Lavalin and then a conglomerate of groups called the
5 TARget Group. And they're all sent the letters from the
6 Cape Breton Partnership on behalf of the Economic
7 Benefits Action Team to have a dialogue or a meeting
8 regarding economics benefits of which we would be giving
9 them all the same presentation on what activities have
10 been underway for -- on behalf of the Cape Breton
11 Partnership. And where they would see the importance of
12 economic benefits within the frame work of the operations
13 that they'll be under -- engaged in with the cleanup.

14 MR. CHARLES: Thanks very much. I
15 appreciate that information. I don't know whether it
16 came through clearly in your presentation or not, but I'm
17 going to ask this question to you. Is your group in
18 support of the project as outlined in the EIS?

19 MR. MACDONALD: The Action Team was also
20 -- or the Cape Breton Partnership received an
21 intervenor's status from funding from CEAA as well. We
22 were all grouped together under one package. And all of
23 the organization has the access of a consultant, Dillon
24 Consulting to develop a piece of work that you've
25 referenced in one of the other sessions today. And we've

1 all basically utilized that to shape our position which
2 is that the organization feels that the technologies are
3 proven and safe. And that risk will be mitigated as the
4 project moves forward.

5 MR. CHARLES: That's fine. I just wanted
6 to establish that you were in agreement with the other
7 members of your group. With regards to the community
8 that you're familiar with and which you deal with all the
9 time, sort of the business community, do you have any
10 sense of how they feel about the project? Are they in
11 favour or against it or don't care? I mean, we've been
12 talking about the silent majority. I'm trying to get a
13 handle on the silent majority.

14 MR. MACDONALD: The business community, I
15 think, clearly have said to us that, "We're satisfied and
16 that what the Proponent has laid out is what we're
17 willing to support."

18 Obviously, the Partnership is made up of
19 Chambers of Commerce from this area, also the Strait
20 Area, right across the Island, and many other groups, but
21 the business portion of that has, you know, especially
22 here in CBRM where the Sydney and Area Chamber has
23 clearly put their support with the Proponent and said
24 that they would support that.

25 MR. CHARLES: Okay. And I realize it's

1 \$400 million dollars, or a little bit less now that some
2 of the other works have gone forward, but there are
3 different ways of carrying out the project, and I just
4 wanted to get a sense of how your business community felt
5 about this particular plan for carrying out the project,
6 and I take it you're saying they're in favour of it.

7 MR. MALONEY: We're in favour of it. One
8 of the major things that we had said right from the
9 beginning was that it had to be a tried method, a proven
10 method for this cleanup, it had to be, we weren't willing
11 to support something that's new and not proven.

12 We didn't want to go down that road, we
13 wanted something that has been done before, and I think
14 that's what the experts and the Proponent have said, that
15 this is a proven technology and that it will work and it
16 will be safe, and that we have to take it at face value,
17 and that's what we've done.

18 MR. CHARLES: Thank you very much.

19 MR. MALONEY: You're welcome.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: I am going to -- we are
21 meant to be breaking around 5 o'clock, so I would like to
22 keep fairly close to that, if we can, please, but I will
23 ask very briefly for questions.

24 I'll turn first to the Agency. Do you
25 have a question for the presenters?

1 MR. POTTER: Yes, one question, and maybe
2 just a point of clarification first.

3 In terms of the bidders on the engineering
4 work, it's essentially Lavalin with Jacques Whitford, a
5 local firm, one of our -- AMEC along with Golder, another
6 firm, have teamed up, and Earth Tech, again one of our
7 team members here with CBCL in Sydney, are the other
8 three partnerships.

9 The question I have -- and, first of all,
10 I just want to thank the Partnership for coming today.
11 Economic benefits is, of course, very important in this
12 project, both in terms of short term and long term and
13 the sustainability of whatever opportunities arise from
14 this cleanup project.

15 I've often said that if at the end of the
16 day all we have left over is some green grass we've
17 failed. There should be something that continues on
18 after this cleanup is done.

19 You did mention in your presentation that
20 -- I think it was 2003 -- you did some tracking looking
21 at the image aspect in Cape Breton. Have you followed
22 that up or are you intending to follow it up shortly?
23 I'm just wondering if you've had any feedback on that.

24 MR. MACDONALD: The Cape Breton
25 Partnership is going to be, in the next few weeks,

1 launching the first phase of a branding initiative that
2 we're putting together for the Cape Breton -- the Strait
3 Area, and that will be completed and launched next
4 September, of which then there will be ongoing monitoring
5 of business and consumer confidence levels, and then
6 after a course of time to be determined we would then
7 reanalyze where the -- if there's been a shift in the
8 brand through this branding process.

9 So, we'll -- I'm sure what we'll be doing
10 is convening some internal focus groups within Cape
11 Breton as well as in Nova Scotia and other key areas in
12 the country.

13 MR. POTTER: Thank you.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I will look
15 first to the registered presenters. Does anyone have a
16 question? Ms. MacLellan and Dr. Ignasiak. I'd like to
17 keep you to one question, if I can, or -- Ms. MacLellan.

18 -----
19 --- QUESTIONED BY MS. MARY-RUTH MACLELLAN

20 MS. MACLELLAN: Could I ask a point of
21 clarification first, Madam Chair?

22 When you talked about the engagement
23 funding, I'm not sure what the name of that funding was.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Community Engagement
25 Fund is what I heard. Mr. Potter is nodding. Is there

1 information about this in the EIS? If there is, I'm
2 sorry, I don't recall it.

3 MS. MACLELLAN: I don't recall it either.

4 MR. POTTER: I don't think we spoke to
5 that in the EIS. I don't believe so.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is that something you
7 would like to bring forward as an undertaking? It might
8 be interesting for us to just know that background.

9 MR. POTTER: Certainly we can do that.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. So, for the
11 record, the Tar Ponds Agency will provide information to
12 the Panel on the Community Engagement Fund. [u]

13 So, now you have a question for the
14 presenters?

15 MS. MACLELLAN: Actually, I had two but I
16 wasn't sure -- I was going to ask you about the second
17 one, so I'll just ask the first one. Okay.

18 Through you to the presenters, given that
19 we have a black stain on our abilities to clean up things
20 or to do things right, given that we've wasted taxpayers'
21 dollars from all Canadians -- i.e. the heavy water plant
22 project to begin with and the last two failed attempts at
23 cleaning it up -- how important is it to you that we do
24 not waste time but at the same time we don't waste one
25 more taxpayer dollar even if it's for economic benefits

1 and that the people are protected first and foremost in
2 the process? Thank you.

3 MR. MALONEY: It's very important to us
4 that this is done right and not wasted. We want to see
5 it done and finished.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
7 you, Ms. MacLellan. Dr. Ignasiak?

8 -----

9 --- QUESTIONED BY DR. LES IGNASIAK

10 DR. IGNASIAK: I think the presenter
11 should really be congratulated on this very good concept
12 of sustainable business legacy at the completion of the
13 project.

14 The little problem that I have with that
15 is that if that's the case perhaps those technologies
16 were not really properly selected, because incineration
17 actual application dropped from 40 percent in '82 to 2
18 percent now and, in fact, we have a tremendous number of
19 plants, incineration plants, that nobody is going to use.

20 And as far as the second selected
21 technology is concerned, solidification/stabilization,
22 I'm afraid this is not really a proven technology for
23 organic-rich wastes.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Was there a question
25 there, Dr. Ignasiak?

1 DR. IGNASIAK: Well ---

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Because there should
3 have been.

4 DR. IGNASIAK: --- the question -- yes.
5 The question is whether the gentlemen are really aware of
6 that.

7 MR. MACDONALD: Aware that there's other
8 technologies available? Is that ---

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: I ---

10 DR. IGNASIAK: I will try to simplify
11 that. The question is ---

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well ---

13 DR. IGNASIAK: Sorry. Sorry. Would you
14 like to take over?

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, you place your
16 question and then I'll decide whether I really think it's
17 a valid question in this case.

18 DR. IGNASIAK: The question is whether the
19 gentlemen are aware that incineration application right
20 now is nose-diving from 40 percent to 2 percent of
21 projects and the other technology, main technology that
22 is going to be used here, the solidification/
23 stabilization, is not a proven technology for organic-
24 rich wastes.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I'm going to let

1 you respond as you wish. Dr. Ignasiak is making some
2 statements which he's going to amplify in his
3 presentation, but I don't -- really don't expect you to
4 respond, especially to the second part, but whatever
5 you'd like to say in response to that.

6 MR. MACDONALD: Well, we just have to fall
7 back on the -- on our consultant's report which feels
8 that the technologies that are going to be utilized are
9 safe and proven and that have been utilized on other
10 projects effectively in the past in other areas.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. Is
12 there anyone who isn't a registered presenter who has a
13 question for the -- yes? Oh, you are a registered
14 presenter? No, you're not. Oh, well. Mr. Harper?

15 -----

16 --- QUESTIONED BY MR. DUFF HARPER

17 MR. HARPER: Thank you, Madam Chair. My
18 question is, one of your slides up there had indicated
19 that you want to have the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Site
20 effectively cleaned up. I believe that's what you
21 stated. And I'm zeroing in on the phrase "cleaned up."

22 Now, we've heard from the Sydney Tar Ponds
23 Agency and we know that the remediation of the Tar Ponds
24 and Coke Ovens Site will result in a lot of contamination
25 still remaining on site.

1 So, my question is, do you consider the
2 fact that there's still going to be contamination
3 remaining on site to be an effective cleanup?

4 MR. MALONEY: Yes. I believe that what
5 the Proponent has said to us is that if they do it in
6 this process, although it will still be there, it will be
7 encapsulated and it's a safe process to do it. Would I
8 like to see more of it gone? Yes. That may be by
9 incineration, maybe incineration may fall off the table,
10 we don't know.

11 This may be the Tar Ponds Full Panel --
12 their consideration. We'll accept whatever it is they
13 say, but we do trust what the Proponent has said as being
14 good information.

15 MR. MACDONALD: But to follow up, as an
16 organization the Cape Breton Partnership has put this
17 economic benefits team together to really concentrate on
18 looking on the economic benefits piece with the project
19 and that's where the bulk of our presentation has been
20 focused on and that's ---

21 The majority of our work to date has been
22 trying to build this economic benefits piece and move it
23 forward so that the community can, also at the end of the
24 day, have a reclaimed site and more -- as well have a
25 sustainable business and employment legacy afterwards.

1 So, you know, with our presentation today
2 we've detailed the findings of our consultant that was
3 brought on side with the various organizations through an
4 RFP process and through -- their expert opinion was that
5 the technologies are safe and proven and that once the
6 project is complete that there would be a remediated site
7 that would be safe to move forward on with development
8 and that it'll be reclamated to a level that the
9 community should accept.

10 MR. HARPER: Thank you.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Harper.
12 That concludes our session this afternoon. It is just
13 after 5 o'clock. We are going to break for an hour and
14 we'll resume at 6:00.

15 Thank you very much for your presentation
16 and we'll see people back at 6 o'clock.

17
18 --- RECESS AT 5:05 P.M.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 --- RESUME AT 6:03 P.M.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening ladies and
3 gentlemen, we will get the evening session started. We
4 have just one presenter this evening. But before I turn
5 to our presenter, a couple of housekeeping issues.

6 The first thing is I would just like to
7 explain that we've had some schedule changes for
8 tomorrow. Tomorrow, Saturday, May 13th, Ms. Ouellette,
9 Ms. Debbie Ouellette, was going to -- scheduled to make
10 her presentation at 2:15 and now the questioning after
11 the Sierra Club presentations will be extended until 3:15
12 when we'll have a break and then we will finish the day
13 with the presentation by Mr. Eric Brophy, as was
14 originally -- as is noted in the schedule.

15 Ms. Ouellette's presentation will be made
16 on Monday. Instead of starting at 5:45 on Monday, May
17 15th, we will begin at 5 o'clock, we will start with
18 housekeeping issues as usual and then at 10 past 5:00 Ms.
19 Ouellette will make her presentation. So, that is a
20 schedule change.

21 I also understand that the Tar Ponds
22 Agency has an undertaking that they wish to present. Mr.
23 Potter?

24 MR. POTTER: Actually, we've just reviewed
25 it during the break and we want to make some revisions to

1 it. We reviewed the transcript and it doesn't seem to
2 completely address the question.

3 There was a question asked and a
4 clarification later on in the transcript and the response
5 we've prepared doesn't address the follow-up comments
6 that were requested from the Chair, actually. So, we're
7 going to go back and just rework that one.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Thank you.
9 So, I would now like to welcome our presenters from ECO
10 Canada. And so, as I'm sure you know, you have 40
11 minutes for your presentation, I'll let you know -- if
12 you get that far, I'll let you know five minutes before
13 the end of that. So, we're very pleased to have you here
14 this evening.

15 -----

16 --- PRESENTATION BY ECO CANADA

17 (MR. GRANT TRUMP)

18 MR. TRUMP: Thank you, Madam Chair, and
19 Members of the Joint Review Panel. It's our pleasure to
20 be here. My name is Grant Trump, I'm the president of
21 ECO Canada, the Environmental Careers Organization
22 Canada, and I have with me my colleague from Sydney.

23 MR. ARSENAULT: My name is Greg Arsenault
24 and I am the Atlantic office manager here in Sydney and
25 I'm also a project manager for a labour market

1 information study being conducted on the Tar Ponds.

2 MR. TRUMP: We certainly do appreciate
3 this opportunity to speak to the Joint Review Panel on a
4 beautiful Friday evening, almost 20 degrees, I
5 understand, in Sydney.

6 We're here to, I think, tie together some
7 of the activities that you've heard today. People have
8 been talking about economic development. We're going to
9 be here to talk about long-term human resource capacity.

10 I think there's a recognition that
11 companies don't make companies, people make companies,
12 economies don't make economies, people make those
13 economies, and as a result the common thread that pulls
14 together the environment and the economy is people, and
15 we need to ensure that we have people with the
16 appropriate skills and knowledge to do this sort of work.

17 We need to have those individuals who have
18 those competencies, skills and knowledge, at both the
19 technical level that are going to be required for the
20 cleanup itself as well as for those other activities that
21 are going to occur after the cleanup is finished such to
22 ensure that a legacy is left. And I've heard that term
23 mentioned by other presenters.

24 That legacy we're going to view is in
25 terms of a legacy of people, and those people who have

1 those skills and knowledge, to allow full -- the region
2 to reach its full economic and employment potential.

3 The business of the environment is indeed
4 important to all of us, it is large in our economy. As
5 well, environmental employment is multi-disciplinary and
6 cross-sectoral, as I'm going to talk about shortly, and
7 therefore it is again that link that can link together
8 the future activities.

9 You're going to see from this presentation
10 that we're not here in a lot of cases to answer a lot of
11 questions. With respect, we're here to raise more
12 questions, I think. We're not sure that we have the
13 answers to these particular questions, but we think they
14 should be under due consideration by the Review Panel as
15 you move forward in your activities.

16 As far as our presentation goes, what I'd
17 like to do first of all is go through who ECO Canada is,
18 because some of you may not be aware of our organization.
19 I want to state our general satisfaction with the
20 selected methodologies. We have been part of the so-
21 called JCI intervenor group, and as a result I'm going to
22 refer to that during the presentation.

23 I want to describe some of the
24 deficiencies with respect to enhancing and developing the
25 investment climate and providing social benefits to CBRM,

1 and again we're going to look at this in a broad
2 perspective and tie this into a model that ECO Canada has
3 been developing known as the Sydney Economic Development
4 Model based upon building human resource capacity, so how
5 that all fits together.

6 First of all with respect to ECO Canada,
7 ECO Canada is the Environmental Careers Organization of
8 Canada, we were created in 1992 as a not-for-profit
9 Canadian corporation and we indeed are part of the Sector
10 Council Program of the Government of Canada.

11 ECO Canada has a board of directors of 18
12 individuals, of which four of those individuals are from
13 Atlantic Canada, the remainder are from the academic
14 community representing colleges, universities, technical
15 institutes and CEGEPS, organized labour, as well as
16 industry from across the country.

17 Governments sit ex officio on our board
18 with representation from Environment Canada, Industry
19 Canada, Human Resources Skills Development Canada,
20 EnerCan, INAC, Indian and Northern Affairs, and Public
21 Works and Government Services.

22 ECO Canada has about 300 individuals that
23 participate on national steering committees with the
24 organization and those individuals create a balanced
25 approach to looking at human resource capacity across the

1 country, and indeed are representative of environmental
2 employment in Canada.

3 As I mentioned, we are part of the
4 National Sector Council Program of the Federal
5 Government, or the Government of Canada. The National
6 Sector Council Program has some 31 sector councils
7 nationally that represent approximately 50 percent of
8 Canada's labour market.

9 Our main thrust and objective is to indeed
10 deal with the human resource issues, the people issues,
11 as they apply to employment, and in our specific case
12 those issues as they apply to environmental employment.

13 It's very important, I believe, that we
14 talk about environmental employment and not necessarily
15 employment in the environment industry. A large number
16 of individuals who have environmental employment do not
17 work in the so-called environment industry. That is
18 those companies whose primary source of revenue comes
19 from providing environmental goods and services.

20 Indeed, they work in companies with
21 environmental interests, whether they be oil and gas
22 companies, mining companies, forestry companies,
23 fisheries, and so on and so forth. And we have found,
24 indeed, that the competency, skills and knowledge
25 required by those people who work in those sectors of the

1 economy are exactly the same as those who work in
2 environment industry companies.

3 We are a partnership, as I've indicated,
4 between industry, government and the academic community,
5 and that should be governments, plural, because it's
6 governments, federal, provincial, municipal and
7 aboriginal.

8 We opened our office in Sydney, Nova
9 Scotia in 2002 and have been quite active in Atlantic
10 Canada since we opened up the organization in the mid-
11 '90s and we've offered projects in virtually every single
12 Atlantic Province to date.

13 The mission of our organization, as you
14 can see from the overhead, is to ensure an adequate
15 supply of people with demonstrated skills and knowledge,
16 required to meet the environmental human resource needs
17 of the public and private sectors.

18 As a result, that mission statement is
19 both quantitative and qualitative. It is quantitative to
20 ensure that we have an accurate number of people to meet
21 the requirements and it's quantitative [sic] to ensure
22 that they have the appropriate skills and knowledge to do
23 the work.

24 We are the keepers of the National
25 Occupational Standards for environmental employment which

1 have been reviewed by some 3,000 individuals across the
2 country and do indeed have classifications around
3 environmental protection, a very specific one dealing
4 with reclamation and remediation, conservation and
5 preservation of natural resources and environmental
6 sustainability.

7 We are also the ISO accreditation agency
8 for Environmental Management Systems Auditors for Canada.
9 We have a variety of relevant projects, we believe, to
10 this particular intervention and to this Panel.

11 First of all, in our Atlantic Canada
12 office located here in Sydney, we have two projects, our
13 environmental skills internship program, our ESI project
14 that I'll talk about in a moment which is funded by the
15 Cape Breton Growth Fund, and the second project is our
16 labour market information, or our LMI project for Cape
17 Breton which is funded by Service Canada.

18 We happen to believe very seriously that
19 without good labour market information good decisions
20 cannot be made.

21 My background is that I am an ex academic,
22 I spent 18 years as a chemist in post-secondary
23 education, and we believe that if it's not documented
24 it's not reviewable, and if it's not reviewable then
25 there's not much sense in moving forward with that

1 activity.

2 So, you will note from the activities that
3 we do we tend to document to a high degree the activities
4 that we're involved with.

5 Our national office is involved in two
6 main projects that we believe are critical for this
7 discussion as well. One is a project known as BEAHR,
8 Building Environmental Aboriginal Human Resources, that
9 I'll talk about in a moment, inclusion of aboriginal
10 people in environmental activities and how that is
11 pertinent to this project with the set-aside that we are
12 all aware of.

13 The second major project that we're
14 involved with is a Federal/Non-Federal Contaminated Site
15 Labour Market Information Study. We are doing work right
16 now to pull together very specific labour market
17 information, supply and demand, on both federal and non-
18 federal sites. We do this in partnership with the --
19 with industry. Oh, something seems to have gone wrong
20 here. Oh, sorry.

21 Our Federal and Non-Federal Contaminated
22 Site Study is indeed a labour market study that we are
23 doing with the Government of Canada, with Public Works
24 and Government Services Canada and with Human Resources
25 Skills Development Canada, and the goal of this project

1 is to deal on the federal sites with the FCSAP, the
2 Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan, to document for
3 that \$3.5 billion dollar expenditure the complete demand
4 that's going to be required in terms of human resources,
5 looking at the actual activities, the classification of
6 individuals, the competencies that will be required,
7 tying that in with the FCSAP data and then from that
8 looking at the demand side, going to the supply side.

9 And that's the supply side in terms of
10 activities that are related to not only those new
11 graduates that would be coming from post-secondary
12 education and other sources but indeed individuals who
13 would be coming from other activities that would allow
14 this to occur.

15 Now, our particular activities in that
16 area are critical because we believe that on the labour
17 market information side what we have are those activities
18 that can contribute to this particular project.

19 Oh, something is not right here. I'll
20 talk about our environmental skills internship program.

21 First of all, our environmental skills
22 internship program is a program that we've put together,
23 there's a commitment that we've made to young Canadians
24 who have made a commitment to us by completing post-
25 secondary education.

1 It's a partnership, I think as I've
2 mentioned, with the Cape Breton Growth Fund, it has a
3 local steering committee and that local steering
4 committee indeed helps us direct this program.

5 We have placed young interns in these
6 projects, they are gainfully employed, we have had a
7 hundred percent retention rate of the interns within the
8 program, and again it's to assist local companies in
9 building local capacity within their site remediation/
10 reclamation activities and their environmental
11 activities.

12 With respect to our LMI activities in Cape
13 Breton, our labour market information, we believe that
14 labour market information is the key to the economic
15 activities, it's the key driver. If we have good
16 information on what are the supply, what's the demand of
17 labour forces, then we'll be able to move forward.

18 We need to, of course, ensure that we're
19 putting -- that we all have a common language and logic
20 when we put this together, and as a result we use very
21 distinct definitions in our LMI work, whether it's our
22 LMI in Cape Breton or whether it's our LMI that we do in
23 the national scene.

24 We ensure that the language and logic is
25 similar and, therefore, we can talk about it. We can

1 compare values by using national occupational
2 classifications, the national system for occupations, and
3 again we can use Stats Canada data as it fits.

4 One of the most important aspects of this
5 is going to be to do a gap analysis. That is, once we
6 have the supply/demand information, we'll be able to move
7 to the gap analysis.

8 Our BEAHR project, our Building
9 Environmental Aboriginal Human Resources project. The
10 BEAHR project is the largest aboriginal environmental
11 project in Canada. It is a partnership between ECO
12 Canada and the Aboriginal Human Resource Development
13 Council of Canada.

14 The authority, therefore, from the
15 aboriginal communities comes from the full participation
16 of the Aboriginal Human Resource Development Council of
17 Canada, who involves all of the AHRDA holders in Canada,
18 that is the Aboriginal Human Resource Development
19 Agreement holders which will be involved in this project
20 as well.

21 We do have a BEAHR learning institute
22 located at the University of Saskatchewan and we have --
23 that's our administrative centre, and we're looking at
24 setting up other BEAHR learning institutes at other post-
25 secondary educational institutes across Canada.

1 The BEAHR learning -- or the BEAHR project
2 is committed to increasing aboriginal employment in the
3 environment sector through career awareness, and we have
4 a variety of what we believe are the best quality career
5 awareness materials to attract young aboriginal people
6 into projects, provision of training for employment
7 resources and recognition of environmental excellence.

8 As well, with respect to the aboriginal
9 community we're doing a pilot project for aboriginal
10 people that are over the age of 30. You may or may not
11 recognize that 46 percent of aboriginal people that
12 graduate post-secondary education today are over the age
13 of 30.

14 As a result, they're not eligible for any
15 school-to-work transition programs -- they're for youth
16 -- and we're setting up a pilot project in the Province
17 of Alberta to facilitate that school-to-work transition
18 for aboriginal people that are beyond that age.

19 I've talked about our Federal Contaminated
20 and Non-Federal Contaminated Site Program, the federal
21 program involving FCSAP, the non-federal site is to look
22 -- is involving the Canadian Councils of Ministers of the
23 Environment, the Canadian Brownfields Network, the
24 Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

25 Once again, we realize it's very complex

1 and we've got a variety of complex issues to deal with.
2 It's already been indicated through FCSAP and through the
3 Panel that 60 percent of the \$3.5 billion dollar
4 expenditure for the Federal Contaminated Site Program
5 will be spent north of 60, and therefore there'll be a
6 tremendous involvement of aboriginal communities in there
7 and we view that this is -- fits well with the set-aside
8 here in Sydney.

9 With respect to the Environmental Impact
10 Statement, the EIS, Objective No. 1, as you're well
11 aware, to reduce the current ecological health risks, the
12 Proponent has provided an extensive analysis.

13 ECO Canada generally supports the
14 methodology chosen by the Proponent for moving forward
15 with this cleanup. We're not here to talk about those
16 particular activities. Again, we believe in our JCI --
17 or the JCI intervenor group, that we've stated what our
18 activities are.

19 With respect to the second objective, the
20 second objective is to enhance the development and
21 investment climate in the CBRM and provide social
22 benefits for CBRM as a whole. We believe it describes
23 the current socioeconomic conditions but we believe it
24 does not adequately consider future site use.

25 We recognize in the care and maintenance

1 activities once the site is contained, cleaned up, that
2 indeed there will be minimal jobs in care and
3 maintenance, therefore those other activities will be
4 critical to the human resource requirements as we move
5 forward, and again that legacy being left of individuals
6 that can do the work.

7 We're fully aware of the fact that
8 environmental skills are also transferrable skills, and
9 therefore those individuals would be able to move to
10 other sectors of the economy where their environmental
11 skills and their other skills could be utilized.

12 We believe as well that it does not
13 adequately describe the potential effects of the proposed
14 project on demographics, education, training and skills
15 levels and the capacity in this particular area.

16 We do believe that detailed labour market
17 information is absolutely critical to this to give us
18 full indication of who's available now, who's available
19 today, what is the capacities and not just at the elite
20 level, the elite level being defined as those individuals
21 who have completed post-secondary education, but also for
22 other individuals who will be involved in the economy at
23 other levels.

24 We want to tie this to the environmental
25 capacity. We believe this should be tied to the skills

1 of the general economy as well in future directions that
2 will be determined by the region as to where things will
3 go, and making certain that we have available those
4 transferable skills that will allow new employers and new
5 businesses within the Cape Breton region and within the
6 Sydney region to reach their full economic and employment
7 potential.

8 Also, with respect to the second -- our
9 second objective, the absence, as I've mentioned, as the
10 future site use, what's next for these activities, we
11 would indeed be in a greater comfort level if there was a
12 comprehensive community economic benefits plan that deal
13 with human resource capacity, not just business capacity,
14 because as I've mentioned it's people that are going to
15 make the companies, and what are those people going to be
16 required to do, what are the skills and knowledge levels.

17 We are not just looking at new entry level
18 people, we'll be looking at individuals coming from other
19 areas of employment. We firmly understand that change is
20 the rule not the exception, and as a result we will see
21 changes as time goes on.

22 And how are we going to meet those
23 requirements? How are we going to allow people to
24 recognize that they have the skills required and how are
25 we going to allow them to recognize where their gaps are

1 so that they can fill those particular gaps?

2 That ties in with the future site use as
3 well as the community legacy plan, and that legacy plan
4 is in terms of infrastructure, business, and we believe
5 we cannot forget human resource capacity in that
6 particular plan.

7 I would like to very briefly talk a little
8 bit about the Sydney Model in the time remaining and some
9 of the aspects that we have, but first of all I would
10 like to talk about environmental employment in Canada to
11 give the Panel a fuller picture, I believe, of the
12 situation that we're in.

13 The fact is in Canada, according to the
14 2004 Environmental Labour Market Report that I'd be
15 pleased to give copies to you -- this is statistically
16 significant data about Canada's environmental labour
17 market, it correlates with Stats Canada, and the 2007
18 report is being prepared as we speak.

19 It's interesting to note this is the
20 second time this report has been done, the report was
21 done in the year 2000 as well, and from the 2000 report
22 to the 2004 report it was noted that environmental
23 employment in Canada grew at a 60 percent faster rate
24 than growth in the general Canadian economy.

25 This is indicative that Sydney and the

1 cleanup of the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Sites and
2 others are not the only groups in the country that are
3 looking for people with environmental capability. The
4 fact is environmental capability is in high demand across
5 this country.

6 We now have about a quarter of a million
7 people, 251,000 people to be exact, that are involved in
8 environmental employment by very strict definitions --
9 that's their primary reason for employment -- and that's
10 in about 10,100 different public and private sector
11 organizations.

12 In the 2000 report we found that there
13 were 4,200 vacancies. Those are documented vacancies
14 from companies that indicated if they could find people
15 with the appropriate skills and knowledge they would hire
16 them. In the 2004 report that had almost tripled to
17 11,800 vacancies. The fact is, then, that we are in a
18 situation where environmental employment is growing
19 quickly and we are not keeping pace nationally.

20 Organizations that are currently
21 recruiting and reporting through our survey instrument
22 are about 25 percent, so about a quarter of all
23 businesses say they're actively recruiting. Very
24 interesting to note as well that about four out of five,
25 or about 80 percent of companies, reported that their

1 employees needed some type of upgrading, skills
2 upgrading, either technical or non-technical, in these
3 particular areas.

4 So, indeed we have a human resource issue
5 to deal with. We've predicted in this particular report
6 that over the past three years to 2006 that environmental
7 employment would grow by 16 percent and that would mean
8 27,000 new positions, and it should be noted that upon
9 initial survey of the data that we think we're probably
10 going to exceed those particular numbers.

11 We've seen very large numbers that have
12 come out through the Government of Canada for the FCSAP
13 or the cleanup of the federal contaminated sites in the
14 number of individuals that are going to be required, and
15 once again this will be in direct competition with those
16 particular activities.

17 I should point out as well in another
18 publication, Fortune Magazine, in the March 21st last
19 year addition Fortune Magazine had the hot 10 careers for
20 the next 10 years, and by 12 percentage points the number
21 one career was site remediation and reclamation people.
22 That was 12 percentage points over IT.

23 The article went on to say that in the
24 United States that they were preparing to export
25 environmental services, and I can assure you -- and we've

1 heard this as well -- that there's lots of companies and
2 organizations outside our own borders that are ready,
3 willing and able to come in and do the work for us. So,
4 creating that legacy is going to ensure -- going to
5 require ensuring that we have the people to do the work
6 for us.

7 With respect to human capital development,
8 this is the legacy that we see, and I think we need to
9 include a variety of activities, as I've mentioned, from
10 the elite, the university graduate, the college graduate
11 folk, down through the entire labour market.

12 Our organization works with the
13 International Union of Operating Engineers, they sit on
14 our board of directors, so we're familiar with that, with
15 LIUNA, the Labourers International Union, as well.

16 But the question, I think, is to what
17 extent is economic growth in modern economies driven by
18 the population's acquisition of knowledge and skills or
19 human capital? The scientific answer to that has proven
20 to be surprisingly elusive. We have not been able to
21 answer that question definitively.

22 We recognize that, however, when we start
23 with companies and we look at their balance sheets, the
24 largest line on their balance sheets is always salaries
25 and benefits. So, it's a pretty important aspect with

1 respect to corporations in Canada and around the world.
2 Do they indeed have the people to do the work and are
3 those people available when they need them to do the
4 work?

5 We have to look at the cost of -- or the
6 return on training investment, because I think we
7 recognize that there is going to be some training
8 involved here. Return on training investment is also a
9 very difficult factor to measure. One can look at it
10 from the other side and say, what's the cost of not
11 investing, of having somebody else come in and do it for
12 us?

13 We have to recognize as well that parts of
14 these activities -- a huge amount of this activity is
15 going to involve the service sector. We recognize that
16 the service sector of the economy has one and only one
17 competitive advantage, and that is the skills and
18 knowledge of its people, and if it doesn't have qualified
19 skilled and knowledgeable people, you don't have a
20 service sector.

21 So, the question is, how are we going to
22 deal with that, how are we going to support that, and
23 there's a variety of common themes that come out as we
24 begin to talk about this human capital, and of course
25 it's also subject to public opinion, and public opinion

1 is -- there's never a lack of public opinion in how this
2 is going to work.

3 We have to be reactionary and we have to
4 look at this as a preventative strategy to ensure that we
5 can meet our full economic and employment potential and
6 have the human capital. It's all going to require a
7 detailed, documented plan to allow this to move forward.

8 Once again, I believe that we need to have
9 common language and logic. In a lot of cases we don't
10 have common language and logic when we talk about these
11 activities. We need to talk about human capital.

12 The definition we use for human capital is
13 the OECD definition, and that's the knowledge and skills,
14 competencies and other attributes embodied in individuals
15 that are relevant to economic activity, and we define
16 those in terms of national occupational standards and
17 competency statements that are required for different
18 occupations.

19 We recognize as well that social capital
20 is an important consideration as we move forward, the
21 networks, the norms, the trusts that allow social
22 agencies and institutions to be more effective in
23 achieving their common objectives.

24 We also recognize that this is -- and has
25 been pointed out by the Chair -- that this is indeed

1 subject to the political economy as well and that the
2 political economy for a lot of these activities are going
3 to drive these particular activities.

4 The Sydney Model, as I had mentioned to
5 you initially, this is the Sydney Model for economic
6 development that we are -- that ECO Canada is currently
7 developing, and again we ask a lot of questions.

8 We don't necessarily have the answers to
9 these questions, and in most cases we don't, but we
10 thought it might be useful for the Panel to see some of
11 the questions that we are asking in terms of these
12 economic development models, in terms of the labour
13 market information studies that we're doing with respect
14 to Cape Breton and with respect to the activities that
15 we're doing in our environmental skills internship
16 programs in Cape Breton.

17 Our assumptions are that building
18 capacity, human and corporate, develop around a local
19 issue and that can drive the economy today and in the
20 future, and there's no doubt that the local issue that is
21 of discussion here are the Sydney Tar Ponds and the Coke
22 Ovens remediation. So, we have a local issue. How,
23 indeed, can we build the economy today and in the future
24 around that?

25 Secondly, good technical and business

1 skills are transferrable from one sector of the economy
2 to the other. So, as a result, what we build for today
3 will be portable and can be used tomorrow for a variety
4 of other activities.

5 However, it's going to require some lead
6 time for us to know what are we going to use it for so
7 that we can again begin to build those competencies and
8 we can allow folks to have the time to plan for the
9 adaptation of those competencies.

10 As I've mentioned, change is the rule not
11 the exception, and we're going to see great changes and
12 we have to make certain that the people are a part of
13 those changes.

14 And then, of course, the flexibility of
15 the labour market will meet the current and future social
16 objectives, those idea of transferrable skills and how
17 they fit into this and how do we measure these.

18 We have a variety of policy questions.
19 The solid information is going to be required to answer
20 these questions to build an economic development model
21 that we'll have good confidence in, and those policy
22 questions are going to revolve around the level of skill
23 demand required to meet the economic objectives.

24 Do we know what that level is? We may
25 have supply data, we have demand data, but is that

1 reflective of what's going to be required to do these
2 particular tasks? What's the plan? What's in the
3 future?

4 How indeed can we deal with the
5 transferability of these activities? What's the level of
6 skill demand required to meet the social objectives?
7 Because it can't just be economic objectives, we have to
8 tie that in with the social objectives.

9 What are the current levels of skill
10 demand in various contexts, at work, at home, in the
11 community? How is demand expected to change over the
12 medium term? Our crystal ball can't -- we have a hard
13 enough time going a month or two down the road, a year or
14 two down the road, rather than trying to go 10 or 20
15 years down the road.

16 So, how is this going to fit in with
17 society today as it exists? What's the current supply of
18 the skill? How is the supply of the skill expected to
19 evolve over the medium term? How does that fit in with
20 post-secondary education, with PSE?

21 How does it fit in with the downturn
22 through sectors of the economy, in the local economy,
23 that are undergoing negative adjustment? How can we turn
24 that into a positive situation for those people with good
25 transferable skills?

1 Is the supply of skill adequate to meet
2 the anticipated social and economic demand? Can we
3 answer that question? And, if not, is it possible to
4 build that internally or locally or are we going to have
5 to go outside?

6 Next, is there evidence that the
7 macroeconomic growth, productive growth and technical
8 innovations are constrained by a skill shortage? Is it
9 limiting the ability to reach our full economic and
10 employment potential?

11 Is the fact that there's a -- the labour
12 force that's present, is it meeting those requirements or
13 could it be more productive or could it be larger? Could
14 it allow for a larger production?

15 This will, of course, require that we look
16 at supply and demand, which indeed we're doing, but that
17 gap analysis is going to be absolutely critical between
18 supply and demand and then how we fill that.

19 Is there a perception of a gap analysis,
20 or is it reality? And again, we need quantitative
21 information to answer those questions.

22 What's the nature of these skills
23 deficits? How long is it going to take to fill those
24 skills deficits? Do we have a labour supply that is
25 close to or do we have a labour supply that's a long way

1 from? How do we do those evaluations? What's going to
2 be the role of the initial education system in meeting
3 these skills deficits?

4 We already have built infrastructures.
5 Could there be improvements in quality, in quantity,
6 social distribution, skill flow out of the initial
7 education system, could it meet the demand? Is there the
8 capacity there? Is the faculty there? Are the teachers
9 there in order to allow that to occur with the skills and
10 knowledge that's going to be required for those
11 activities? What role can the adult learning system
12 play, formal, informal, non-formal?

13 Again, the question that I believe that
14 we're putting here is training for what? Training and
15 education is all part of -- is part of what we're here to
16 talk about, but training and education for what?

17 Do we have the answers from this, from
18 these documents, that allow us to make guesses, to make
19 educated decisions to base these upon? What do we think
20 we know? Well, we think we know, if we measure people's
21 actual skills rather than their educational
22 qualification, human capital becomes a clear predictor of
23 economic growth, because a lot of folks have a lot of
24 good skills, knowledge and competencies, but they don't
25 have credential, academic credential.

1 So, indeed, we view that we have to be
2 able to evaluate that, that we have to look at the actual
3 competencies that people have, to give us a better
4 picture so we can fill some of those gaps.

5 We also know that the entire labour market
6 must be included in the analysis. It can not just be the
7 elite group. It can not just be the college university
8 graduates, the post secondary educational graduates. It,
9 indeed, must be other individuals who come from other
10 activities, other skillsets that are required in the
11 economy.

12 Scientific data shows that if the
13 country's literacy score is raised by 1 percent, we can
14 expect to see a 2.5 percent relative rise in labour
15 productivity, and a 1.5 percent rise in GDP per head.
16 And these effects are three times as great as investments
17 in physical capital.

18 So how are we going to do this particular
19 investment such that that legacy is assured for Sydney.

20 With respect to the overall analysis,
21 then, of the Sydney model, we need to be well aware of
22 those particular current issues, and we need to identify
23 all of the contextual variables.

24 Those contextual variables are political
25 drivers, economic drivers, legislative drivers, and they,

1 indeed, are tied directly to supply and demand.

2 We need to ensure that we have qualified
3 personnel at all levels. We also need to know that the
4 long-term goals are tied to economic activities, and I
5 think the previous presenters, indeed, tried -- are tying
6 those to the economic activities. We're here to tie it
7 to what's the thread that's required to do that, that's
8 the people, the human resource capacity.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Trump, you have 5
10 more minutes.

11 MR. TRUMP: Thank you. We have, as well,
12 to look at similar national and international activities,
13 and how it's been done in other jurisdictions, and how
14 this can work.

15 We need to look, as well, at those
16 transferrable skills, recognizing that the model will
17 evolve, recognizing that the cleanup, the remediation,
18 the reclamation activities will come to a close, they
19 will come to -- activities that will revolve around care
20 and maintenance and, as a result, the human resource
21 requirements will probably, in all likelihood, go down.

22 What is the current infrastructure, what's
23 the plan for growth of the current infrastructure, and
24 what are the realistic goals that fit with this?

25 The Sydney model, therefore, is an

1 economic development model that's built upon the
2 development of human capital. It's based upon people.
3 We're building such that it's realistic in terms of both
4 structure and time lines. It's measurable. It can allow
5 for communication with individuals. It requires
6 considerable data collection, and it requires a plan of
7 action for the future.

8 We believe there are tremendous
9 opportunities here. There are opportunities to increase
10 resource capacity for young people through internship
11 programmes. We believe there's also opportunities for
12 remediation expertise, management expertise.

13 There's going to be contracts let in the
14 Sydney area that are probably the largest contracts that
15 have ever been let in this area in recent times on this
16 remediation and reclamation. Do we have -- we may have
17 the technical capability, do we, indeed, have the
18 management capability to handle those activities?

19 How are we going to monitor those economic
20 benefits, and how are we going to communicate that to the
21 community so that it's well understood?

22 Our steps, therefore, we have the
23 internships, we have the management training that fit
24 into the activities, we have our supply/demand analysis
25 that we're doing with Service Canada, we have a defined

1 Sydney model that we're beginning to put the meat on the
2 bones, if you will, with respect to documenting the model
3 and then taking it out for approval. We are, again,
4 rigorous documenters to how it all fits together, and
5 then we want to roll that particular model out to these
6 activities.

7 That brings -- we want to roll it out in
8 terms of implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

9 Madam Chairman, that brings us to the end
10 of our formal presentation. I would point out that our
11 website is located at www.eco.ca and it is a very large
12 information-based website, and you will find a fair
13 amount of information about these activities that I've
14 mentioned on that site.

15 --- QUESTIONED BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL:

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Trump, thank you
17 very much for your presentation. You warned us at the
18 beginning of the presentation that you were here to raise
19 questions, and not answer them. I trust -- you certainly
20 raised questions. I trust you were not being literal in
21 terms of not answering questions, because I think we
22 might have some for you.

23 Your presentation was wide ranging, and,
24 in some senses, at a high level, and I appreciate that.

25 I guess I'm interested in knowing how you

1 see -- we've been told already that there are -- there's
2 a labour market analysis under way, and that there's
3 going to be gap analysis studies carried out.

4 In terms of the timing of the remediation
5 project, as you know it, have you any reflections on how
6 much time, in fact, is available to fill any of these
7 gaps, especially in terms of training in the local area?

8 MR. TRUMP: Madam Chair, I believe that --
9 we've certainly heard that there are labour market
10 information type data that's being gathered. We have not
11 seen that information as of yet, and so, as a result,
12 that's why we are moving in, with the projects that we
13 have, with Service Canada. And we're doing that project
14 for Cape Breton Island, so we're indeed -- while Sydney
15 is part of it, we're putting it together for the entire
16 Island, because we also believe that the entire Island
17 will be involved in this remediation activity.

18 Labour market information, as you know, is
19 very -- it's a tricky thing to get a handle on, because
20 you have to ask the right questions. You have to make
21 certain that individuals, indeed, are forthcoming with
22 the supply and the demand.

23 We certainly -- we are ready/willing to
24 partner, part of our activities are, indeed, partnership
25 activities with other organizations, to co-operate on

1 getting the best picture we can for that labour market
2 information.

3 We anticipate moving very quickly on our
4 labour market information, to collect that particular
5 data. Some of that information will be tied upon the
6 deliberations of this panel review and the next steps.

7 Certainly, in the immediacy, once
8 technologies are selected, and so on and so forth, that
9 will then, in some degree, define the competencies,
10 technical competencies required within the labour market
11 and, as a result, we want to make certain we have that
12 available, that we can extract that information very
13 quickly.

14 We are in -- we work with local post
15 secondary education institutes, whether it's Cape Breton
16 University or Nova Scotia Community College, once again,
17 to talk about how, indeed, can we -- could we bring these
18 programmes up to speed.

19 As a national organization, we also
20 partner with two other groups, that is the Canadian
21 College Environmental Network and the Canadian Council of
22 University Environmental Science Programme Heads and the
23 Environmental Studies Association of Canada. Those
24 organizations are well established. Those organizations,
25 as well, are ready, willing and able to share curriculum,

1 to share expertise, to fill gaps that may be found here
2 in the local region.

3 So I think it's one of the first times
4 we'll be looking at national post secondary education
5 moving in to assist in building capacity in relative
6 short order.

7 Now, the gap analysis is going to be
8 critical, Madam Chair, because we're not certain how big
9 that gap is going to be. If it's a 40- or 80-hour
10 course, that's one thing. If it's a 4-year or 5-year
11 degree programme, that's something quite different.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: And in circumstances
13 like this, how do you avoid maybe raising unrealistic
14 expectations and having people invest their own
15 resources, savings, whatever, in obtaining training for
16 work that, in the end, may not be available, if too many
17 people take training in expectation of employment? Any
18 thoughts on that?

19 MR. TRUMP: Well, with respect to too many
20 individuals, I think the labour market information across
21 Canada is relatively clear. We've got almost 12,000
22 current vacancies.

23 We find that there is definitely a
24 documented shortage within Canada. And so when we look
25 at this, we look at it in the Canadian context. There

1 may well be employment shortages here after a relative
2 short period of time, but I would think that there would,
3 indeed, be employment in other parts of the country.

4 We also very much support the building of
5 capacity from the activities of the Sydney Tar Ponds and
6 the Coke Oven cleanup to, indeed, create areas of
7 expertise that could be exported from this region.

8 So while the individuals may not always
9 work here, they may, indeed, live here and do their work
10 in other areas of the country, or, indeed, other areas of
11 the world, because there's no shortage of other steel
12 mill, coke oven sites and tar pond facilities in the
13 world that need to be cleaned up.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I know that Cape
15 Breton is well used to exporting their human resources,
16 which isn't always what they want to do.

17 The Sydney model, I'm not sure I really
18 understand what the Sydney model is, to be frank with
19 you. The Sydney model is something -- right now, it's
20 totally predicated on the Tar Ponds cleanup, that's what
21 it's built around, is it?

22 MR. TRUMP: We are building the Sydney
23 model on the Tar Ponds cleanup. We are developing the
24 framework as we speak, and the framework that I've given
25 you, those questions are the questions that we're

1 building the parameters for the model around, and to
2 collect that data is going to be our objective to build
3 that model. We view that that model will, therefore,
4 have applicability across the country, and perhaps even
5 around the world.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: And I presume there'll
7 be an evaluation component built into this model.

8 MR. TRUMP: There will be consultation and
9 evaluation.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Um-hmm. I have one more
11 question. I don't know, were you here earlier this
12 evening before the break?

13 MR. TRUMP: I was here before the break,
14 yes.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: So did you hear my
16 question, pardon me for repeating it, but I was asking
17 questions about gender analysis and about promoting the
18 participation of women in this area.

19 MR. TRUMP: Madam Chair, we strongly --
20 Eco-Canada, the policy of our organization strongly
21 supports those activities and, indeed, we are a catalyst,
22 we believe, to do that.

23 What we're finding right now is, looking
24 at the 2000 report and the 2004 report, that I've
25 indicated, we've seen an increase in participation of

1 women go from some 8 percent to 24 percent in those
2 reports.

3 Our latest reports from post secondary
4 education in general environmental science studies type
5 programming, is that about 50 percent of the population
6 are female in those areas.

7 With respect to the skill trades,
8 apprenticeable trades and other trades, that is not an
9 area in which we have done appreciable work, but we do
10 work with the Canadian Apprenticeship Forum, and we're
11 well aware the Canadian Apprenticeship Forum has been a
12 strong proponent of women involvement in non-traditional
13 trades.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: So within the Sydney
15 model you'll be promoting that and tracking the success?

16 MR. TRUMP: Absolutely.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Great. Thank
18 you.

19 DR. LAPIERRE: Just one question. Thank
20 you for the presentation.

21 In your presentation, you identified that
22 considered future site use was not well defined.

23 What's missing according to you? And I
24 guess we've heard from the Tar Pond Agency and other
25 presenters that there are initiatives under way to

1 identify future use, and we heard this afternoon from the
2 few groups who presented that there was an ongoing
3 economic study.

4 Is there anything else missing, or will
5 those activities provide the information that you think
6 is not presently in the EIS?

7 MR. TRUMP: Assuming that -- those other
8 activities that you've just mentioned, we are aware that
9 they're under way, we were referring to the report
10 itself. Assuming those activities indeed define the
11 future use of the site and those activities such that we
12 can begin to model what's going to be the human resource
13 capacity, how is this going to fit in with the economic
14 model, then that would certainly suffice.

15 MR. CHARLES: I take it since you're sort
16 of preparing a model you don't have any views to express
17 to the panel about the lack of labour resources that
18 might pose a difficulty in having the project go forward,
19 if it were to be approved.

20 MR. TRUMP: I think my comment to that,
21 sir, would be that when we've looked at these other
22 projects, including ones in the north rural remote areas,
23 other projects involving remediation and reclamation,
24 environmental activities, there has always been a very
25 large interest within the communities to be involved, to

1 ensure to take part in it, but there has always been a
2 lack of appropriately skilled folks to meet the
3 requirements when it actually came to do the work.

4 So I don't want to stipulate that that
5 would be the case here, but I think that's why we need to
6 ensure that we have this good supply/demand information
7 so that we can, indeed, predict, and we can, indeed,
8 adjust the activities to see if we can fill those
9 particular requirements.

10 When people look at a lot of these
11 activities, they look at the dollar values, where the
12 dollar values are large, but it requires individuals with
13 very specific skills and competencies, and it requires
14 that the individuals be able to demonstrate those, in our
15 view. And, as a result, then, some of these skills,
16 people may -- again, it's perception/reality, do they
17 indeed have the skills, can they demonstrate the skills,
18 especially when you're talking about a contaminated site
19 cleanup in which health and safety issues are so
20 critical.

21 MR. CHARLES: Thank you. My final
22 question -- well, it's an observation, first of all, then
23 it's a question.

24 For other members of your intervenor
25 group, who have appeared before us, I've asked them to

1 clearly state whether they're in favour of the project or
2 not, and I notice that, in your slide presentation, you
3 have clearly stated, and on the document that I have it's
4 even done in red ink so that it really stands out,
5 indicating you are clearly in favour of the project. My
6 question is, when did you include that in your slide
7 presentation? Was it after today, or was it in there
8 earlier?

9 MR. TRUMP: It has been in there since the
10 beginning.

11 MR. CHARLES: So you sort of figured what
12 I was going to ask, and you were ready for me, eh?

13 MR. TRUMP: That's Eco-Canada's job,
14 predictive.

15 MR. CHARLES: Thanks.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I'll now ask
17 for questions from other participants. Mr. Potter, do
18 you have a couple of questions for Mr. Trump?

19 --- QUESTIONED BY THE SYDNEY TAR PONDS AGENCY:

20 (MR. FRANK POTTER)

21 MR. FRANK POTTER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
22 Thank you, Mr. Trump, Mr. Arsenault.

23 I think you mentioned somewhere in the
24 slide about a perception problem with human capital. I'm
25 not sure if I understood that. I would suspect that

1 there's not much perception of the problem in the capital
2 side from the environmental field. It's sitting here
3 with a group of consultants and ourselves, trying to hire
4 staff, we have no doubt about there being a problem.

5 I'm just curious about that question, that
6 point you had in there about perception.

7 MR. TRUMP: I think what I was referring
8 to was perception versus reality within the public.

9 There is no -- in our experience as well,
10 it is not a Sydney issue. Across Canada there is a
11 labour shortage of qualified environmental practitioners/
12 professionals.

13 MR. POTTER: Thank you. I certainly agree
14 with that.

15 As I mentioned, we're just in the process,
16 right now, of staffing up as an agency, we've been trying
17 to recruit people. Actually, it just so happened this
18 week I met with the officials that are involved with the
19 federal system on the \$3.5 million programme up north,
20 Indian and Northern Affairs in the Yukon Territory.
21 They've been in Sydney this week, sort of learning from
22 our project, trying to understand the problem we had, and
23 how we've tackled it from all aspects, whether it's the
24 funding, the organizational structure. As well, we
25 talked about the HR problems, hiring problems, and they

1 certainly are experiencing that.

2 In relation to the Sydney model, I
3 understand this is a new model being developed, but has
4 there been this approach, or an approach like this tried
5 before somewhere else, and has it been successful?

6 MR. TRUMP: We're not aware of any model
7 that has been -- that has come out that is in the detail
8 that ours is, and looks at those human resource capacity
9 factors.

10 MR. POTTER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Potter.
12 I'll now turn to our registered presenters. Do we have
13 anybody who has a question for the presenters?

14 Is there anybody else in the room who has
15 a question for our presenters?

16 Well, there you are, when they heard you
17 weren't going to answer questions, they gave up, clearly.

18 Well, Mr. Trump and Mr. Arsenault, thank
19 you very much for your presentation. We appreciate that.

20 This completes -- it was a short and sweet
21 evening session, and you can still get out and get a
22 little bit of that sunshine. Thank you all for coming,
23 being here.

24 We meet again tomorrow at 9 o'clock, and
25 so it's going to be another nice day but I know that

1 you're committed and you'll be here, so I look forward to
2 seeing you. Thank you very much.

3

4 --- ADJOURNED TO SATURDAY, MAY 13 AT 9:00 A.M.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTERS

We, Lorrie Boylen, Ruth Bigio, Sandy Adam and Gwen Smith-Dockrill, Court Reporters, hereby certify that we have transcribed the foregoing and that it is a true and accurate transcript of the evidence given in this Public Hearing, SYDNEY TAR PONDS AND COKE OVENS SITES REMEDIATION PROJECT, taken by way of digital recording pursuant to Section 15 of the Court Reporters Act.

Lorrie Boylen, CCR
Sandy Adam, CCR
Ruth Bigio, CCR
Gwen Smith-Dockrill, CCR

Friday, May 12, 2006 at Halifax, Nova Scotia