

Notes for Presentation at Burlington City Hall
- April 25, 1984

I represent the West Burlington Citizens' Group who are concerned about the environmental impact of the proposed expansion of the Burlington landfill.

We urge the City not to pass the motion before it and to continue to express its concerns with the Region's proposed expansion to the Burlington landfill.

My clients have, over the past years, raised concerns regarding the existing site and proposed expansion. Last month, a decision was made to retain a hydrogeologist to review the Region's proposal. I want to stress that our consultant, Mr. Ridley, of Montreal Engineering Company, was given a free hand in coming to a conclusion. Our instructions were to evaluate all four phases of the proposed expansion, their potential impact and whether the engineering was adequate to ensure that no off-site impacts would occur.

I wish to indicate to counsel that our consultants findings are that:

1. There is a leachate plume advancing from the landfill.
2. All four phases of the expansion will add to either a) the volume of leachate produced; b) the time the plume will continue to move off-site; and c)
3. Increased concentration of leachate. This is vividly portrayed at Borehole 17, the borehole located nearest the site boundary. It is our submission that a plume passed by this spot in 1981.

While the Region makes a lot of the fact that the people don't use their water for drinking purposes, there are other concerns. Notably, there are streams travelling through people's property as well as leachate springs and other environmental impacts. We believe the Region's proposal will increase these off-site impacts.

By way of analogy, if there was a gasoline spill at a service station, and a plume formed, the approach would be one of a clean-up by some sort of plume management. It would not be advocated to add more gas to the plume, i.e. to add fuel to the fire. Here the Region should be cleaning up the site, not adding more garbage. It is submitted that the Region may be creating a potential nuisance and trespass situation where my client and others may have rights to bring a civil action. The City should not agree to the expansion. Our review has shown serious technical deficiencies in the report. I would like to now turn to the specific points of the motion before the City. First of all, not one condition deals with groundwater or hydrogeology, our clients' major concern.

1. While the increased setbacks will address somewhat slope stability, it is a minor issue relative to our concerns. As well, with only a 10 metre setback, if there was any slope failure, a contingency plan would not be possible to put in place.

2. This condition is totally inadequate and is in effect, window-dressing. It does not deal with serious concerns of what's going on under the site. Afteruse control should be starting now.

3. A biophysical survey on the site is somewhat irrelevant if there is no off-site analysis. It is almost too late to do a baseline study for off-site impacts and this survey does not contemplate an off-site survey.

4. This condition is vague and doesn't compell the Region to anything. The Region will only listen to the City talk and put their case forward.

5. This condition seems to be a political trade-off bargaining point. The City is not even saying that the site should be cleaned up. However, it is clear that the clean-up should start now.

For all these reasons, we urge the City to protect its residents and insure that a clean-up of the site takes place, not a compounding of a serious environmental problem.

TV:dlb