

Hans Kreplein

FEB. 23. '86

COMMENTS ON

FEB. 17. '86 AGENDA / REPORTS, Region's SWM Committee

In the order of items as given:

① "Intervenor Funding"

Seems to be a preconditio for the Region; the issue gets delayed.

② Printing costs - no comment

③ Bayview leachate collection - conceptual design
(Caledonia Rivers / City of Burlington)

3.1 CRA's report:

Well done, particularly when compared to WWY's work.

[Would have some comments, but they are not appropriate
to make at this time (ask me if you want to know).]

3.2 Region's reaction:

MacKay's report seems to remain neutral and factual
(not bad for the Region); the real response will come via Hydrology Cons
Request for time to respond and the list of subjects (p.17)
appear reasonable and would appear to help the City in
the timing question vis-a-vis MOE.

NOTE: The MAPS in the CRA report will be useful
re. Parkway Belt West submissions.

! → We should use any opportunity to support CRA's findings

④ Target list of compounds - leachate treatability/toxicity

(1) Many commonly encountered contaminants, especially heavy metals,
are NOT included. This may reflect knowledge that they are
simply not amenable to treatment (?).

(... 2)

⑤ Air emissions, Occidental's EFW plant

No comment: Much of the fuss was due to a calculation error.

⑥ SWAC's final report re. EFW /
Ottawa's EMR: EFW Workshop.

No comment on content; Workshop is too expensive.

⑦ Master Plan - Separation at Source

- (1) Cost considerations and lack of remaining landfill cap'y at present site seems to do a lot for generating the Region's political will to increase separation.
- (2) Note, p. 105: No new landfill until after mid-1988.

⑧ Site F conformity (or not) to Parkway Belt West Plan (Act)

- (1) Important reference to the Ontario Planning and Development Act under which the Parkway Belt West Plan is a "development plan".
(!) It is the O.P. & D. Act, not the Parkway Plan, which allows the Minister to declare "no conflict." (See p. 110 / 111)
 - (2) See margin notes, p. 112 / 113; "Halton's Position"
 - item 2: Plan doesn't even anticipate landfill!
 - item 3: "a landfill is a utility needed to support the urban area" is a weak argument; 'F' is the Region's plan (incl. non-urban areas).
 - item 4: landfill is much more than a (permitted) "building or structure"
 - item 5(a): "low density, low intensity character" is a stretched definition of a landfill!
 - " 5(b): "the landfill site can be (made) to meet... the criteria" - but will it be made to do that? let's see the designs, backed up by self-imposed restrictions to achieve that!
- (... 3)

I doubt that site F can be made to comply, but I am certain the Region only offers an empty promise here, i.e. something for the Ministry to find an excuse for approval.

- Item 5(c) (p. 113): Claims "100 m buffer zone surrounding the full area - a false claim."

Continues with parallelism (promises?) - used counterfactuals -

river, "agricultural after-uses" (Official Plan amendment; "passive recreation,

- Item 6: Note, the "General Complementary Use Area" covers only part of site F, but the map (p. 114) does not indicate how much, or which part that is!

- Item 7(a): "Autism" period is 20 years, here!

"7(b): "Site F... can assist in achieving another major goal

of the Parkway Belt, namely the 'Linked open space framework' is really stretching the intent and purpose of the Plan;

A dam across the Belt of 11.32 x 10" cu yd. is hardly existing to link open space.

(Conclusion of R. Williamson):
 "...see we need... to protect an unnecessary Amendment..."
 -> disagree!

(Conclusion of H.K.):

① R. Williamson's report 71/86 shows many weak points of the Region's argument, and they can and should be used by us (incl. CELA).

② See separate proposal for our response (not for publication).

Hein Kessler