

LAST CHANCE

BEFORE REGION MAKES FINAL DECISION ON DUMP SITE

**Your Presence on July 10th
CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE**

PLAN TO ATTEND

**Halton Region's Public Meeting at
Royal Botanical Garden Headquarters
WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1985 7:00 P.M.**

THE ISSUE

- ***Burlington Escarpment Site F still #1 Choice of Consultants***
- ***20 More years of Garbage covering 200 Acres of Escarpment***

THE RESULT

***A Real Life Horror Story — Contaminents oozing out of current site
compounded by 20 more years of polluting will assure citizens of***

- ***Unsafe drinking water due to contaminated land and
polluted streams emptying into Bay and Lake***
- ***Depreciation of property values***
- ***Decrease in quality of Life***
- ***More environmental problems***

The time has come! Speak out now before it's too late.

Regional Council makes decision July 23rd.

Support the stand taken by the West Burlington Citizens Group

NO MORE DUMPING IN ALDERSHOT

**We need your help. Come and fill the Hall.
Show you care what happens to your environment.**

Appeal from West Burlington Citizens Group.

PRESENTATION - REGIONAL PUBLIC MEETING JULY--10, 1985

ROYAL BOTANICAL GARDENS

WALKER, WRIGHT, YOUNG REPORTS

As President of the West Burlington Citizens Group, I am making this presentation based on the comments and feedback I have received from Residents in the area.

I will address two aspects.

- (a) PUBLIC MEETINGS
- (b) SOME OF THE WALKER, WRIGHT, YOUNG REPORTS - I will not attempt to comment on them all.

1. PUBLIC MEETINGS

Time after time people walk out of these public meetings in frustration and anger due to lack of good productive answers and the insensitivity exhibited towards the real concerns of the citizens. Certainly, the Social impact meetings were more than frustrating.

WE FEEL WE ARE BEING IGNORED!

Under the Environmental Assessment Act process, these public meetings are required, right?

What we would like to know is what they produce as far as impact on the final analysis is concerned. Do you just go through the routine because it's required? Are your decisions based on the amount of anger and frustration shown, that is, does the squeaky wheel get the grease? What ultimately do you actually do with the feedback.

I ask these questions because the West Burlington Citizens Group has tried over the past three years to be productive, factual and unbiased in all its contributions--BUT PERHAPS CONSTRUCTIVE, HONEST, INPUT ISN'T WHAT YOU'RE LOOKING FOR!

2. REPORT

The Walker, Wright, Young FINAL REPORT is absolutely no different than the DRAFT REPORT presented earlier. Why did we bother wasting the valuable time of professional people in the community, who had the technical expertise, to provide a critique on your reports, when all the input was obviously ignored.

You may have said you agreed with some of the comments, but in the final analyses they have had absolutely no affect on the rankings.

- (a) Our prime concern of course, is the Hydrogeological aspect which indicates the total unsuitability of this Site. You are well aware of our stand on this subject, and as a matter of critical importance we will continue to oppose this Site.
- (b) In One area in particular, the SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, it was brought out LOUD AND CLEAR at the Public Meeting, that this report was totally inadequate, in fact, it is obvious that the study was set-up in such a way so as to ensure that the Residents of this area would not be included. This has resulted in a distorted ranking of sites, putting Escarpment Site F to the top, NATURALLY!

As a report from the City of Burlington states, this "clearly demonstrates how critically deficient the Walker, Wright, Young 2C Final Report is in ranking Escarpment Site F as the most preferred site, despite the abundance of evidence to the contrary."

(c) OTHER ASPECTS OF CONCERN ARE

(1) TRANSPORTATION

Why wasn't further examination given to this aspect--the City believes that if this was done, the results would have been quite different--putting Site F ranking in 5th place.

(2) COSTS

The costs of this Site will escalate dramatically if we begin examining all the Engineering and safeguards that the "Experts" think will be necessary to make a site safe. For example, a liner. THIS IS NOT THE PERFECT SOLUTION FOR ALL PROBLEMS, AS THEY WOULD HAVE US BELIEVE--A LINER IS NOT FOOLPROOF. It is not a PROVEN PROTECTION to the environment.

(3) AIR TESTING

A question for the expert--Is it correct to assume from the Report that the only testing sites used were the facilities at the Royal Botanical Gardens in Hamilton, the Lester B. Pearson International Airport in Toronto, Kelso in Milton, and Valens near Galt?

How could this possibly reflect the actual

PRESENTATION - REGIONAL PUBLIC MEETING JULY 10, 1985
ROYAL BOTANICAL GARDENS
JULY 10, 1985
PAGE 3

environmental impact of the prevailing winds and the resultant airborne particles over the immediate area to the South East of the dump site?. Is this another area that is being swept under the carpet in the hopes that it will be forgotten or overlooked, or are you actually planning to do more relevant testing.

We find it curious and disturbing that Walker, Wright, Young would suggest that Escarpment Site F would be ideal because it would SOLVE THE CLEAN-UP OF THE BAYVIEW DUMP. Coincidentally N.S.P. have proposed exactly the same solution to this problem--interesting isn't it? After all, wouldn't you agree, this is a good way for National Sewer Pipe to make a lot of money on property they cannot otherwise do anything with?

The question has been put to the West Burlington Citizens Group many times--JUST WHO IS WALKER, WRIGHT, YOUNG WORKING FOR?

DO YOU BELIEVE that the Residents of this area are going to allow another Site here when we are experiencing the potentially serious health-threatening problems of leachate from Bayview, as well as a Region that obviously operates the present site without any regard to environmental guidelines. Why is it necessary for citizens and the news media to be forced into "blowing the whistle" on the Region in order for it to clean-up its act.

ANOTHER SITE?--NO WAY.