

① Transportation Assessment (Draft Jan. '85)

- Good
- Access to site via city streets, the assumed off-ramps from #403 westbound to Waterdown Rd. does not exist:
Route from westbound Q.E.W. is Plains Rd. - N. on Brant St. - W. on North Service Rd. See p. 2-6 to 2-8, 3-3
→ Impact on local traffic is greater than shown: Built-up local street route is 3.2 km vs. 1.0 km [Social Impact] → increases
 - Future increase of local city traffic (above routes) is not included
- Good
- Hauling of cover fill imports required at Site F not included
→ traffic to & from site F is greater than that of other sites
 - Use of entrance to present landfill is not acceptable:
This road & weighscale are over the oldest "dump" portion and the entrance as a park conflicts with truck traffic.
 - New entrance incl (2 turning) lanes required at Site F - not included (turn lanes for exiting as well as entering - the traffic density on North Service Rd. is increasing).
See Appendixes A and B
[See Map 3, "Haulage Routes to Site F"]

⊗ Hauling cover fill to site F is estimated to increase the total traffic related to site F by 25 to 40%, depending on the size of the garbage haul trucks. See p. 4-3

Mar. '85 Hans Kieplin

1st priority: Public health and safety

1.1 Hydrology / hydrogeology (attached Dr. Chang, excerpts)

- The "preliminary" assessment gives insufficient information to support "identification of a preferred site" (object of study)
- Data (sets) provided are incomplete and very few for site F

(ranked #1): Site A B C D E F
Data (sets) given 172 138 165 137 41 5
Average 130.6 ←

Good. This is the reverse of the claim that "comparable level of detail" was to be used, although more data existed for F than (some) other sites.

- "Previous Work" (reports) are almost exclusively on site F, indicating a site selection was made before this report.
- The "previous work" and site F references (Appendix) were largely written to support landfill at F. Warnings in "neutral" reports are not considered.
- This report fixes its scope on the landfill area; it does not refer to any study area, ignoring the (wet) flatland to the south, or the effects of leachate entering

Not
original

The Bay and Lake Ontario.

- The claim that present leachate problems would be reduced is ludicrous; The proposal would place refuse in an excavation on exposed fractured shale (this is the reason for present problems).
- Ignores agreement by all hydrologists at the 1984 EPA hearing that "no dump should have been started in that area in the first place"; Reference - Source
- The slope of the site is not considered; the present landfill shows how liquid pressure in the lower part builds up, causing "leachate springs", i.e. surface contamination.
- Lack of overburden is quoted as a disadvantage at Baudd, but not for F.
- Sets out "general engineering criteria" but does not apply them at site F:
 - Does not provide for adequate cover material or its haulage.
 - The site is basically too small, shortcuts are used to increase capacity by 2 to 3 times for meeting the Region's target.
 - Eliminating buffer zones along existing dumps will make it impossible to correct existing leachate problems underground (leachate continues 100-200 yrs.)
 - Their opinion that no lines of the shale excavation would be required is irresponsible, knowing that

fractured shale is an easy flow path for leachate.

The 1984 EPA hearing accepted no less than 1.5 m of undisturbed clay till as a sole liner.

- No estimate is made of the percentage leachate collected by drains or the percentage escaping.
- The claim that seeping leachate would be harmless in the "deep groundwater" is false: Leachate from Bayview has surfaced at Hwy 403 (and beyond?) - never was investigated.
- Ignores warnings of environmental scientists that the effects of chemicals in (Lake) water - either by themselves or in combination - is not understood well enough, that there are unknown risks, and that we must prevent (irreversible sources of) contamination.
- Does not consider why all other "pits and quarries" were eliminated as candidate sites.

Conclusion: Clearly, the site is unsuitable and too small. The report vainly attempts to support a predetermined choice of this site by irresponsible design shortcuts and by ignoring the true environmental consequences.