

NOTES (by H. Kreplin)

Verbal summary presentation of

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, Feb. 10, '87

by Peter Walker, Walker Wright Young Assoc's

to P.Wks. & ENVIR. COMMITTEES, HALTON REGION
& the public.

Chairman: Pat McLaughlin (Burlington)

Present: G. Krantz, Mayor of Milton
(Table)

Penelope Sheldon (Halton Hills)

W. Mulkewich (B.)

J. Little (B.)

J. E. Fleming, new Regional CAO

Liz. Behrens (Oakville)

R. Demetris (Z)

Peter Powersoy (Regional Chairman / Halton Hills)

Will. Johnson (M)

-> (8 pages)

P. Walker presentation: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

1. Add'l info. (after EA document) on technical issues incl'd. - prepared at Council's request.

Framework from ZC was not fully appropriate, but this analysis still refers to it

Has gone over technical details with the specialists in a "critical review" and got from them new comparisons.

Evaluation factors ~~were~~ of ZC were revised, e.g. costs (viewpoint), "Vennin" now in Health & Welfare.

Now or amended meanings were included as a result. Specialists had to rework their assessments.

2. Summarizing the analysis:

Both sites now fully engineered - narrowed gap
"Vennin" adds concern at flying field:

→ Both sites can be made safe

Higher impact on biological environment at F.

At P, agricultural impact is higher.

Social enviro't: F preferred - all factors (except one)

Cultural (heritage) F "

Cost - No differential (P cost less at Stage ZC)

Narrow gap in Public Health & Safety.

(... 2)

Feb. 10, '87

Summary conclusion:

Both suitable, and F appears best overall.



Walter Mulheide (Burl.) vs. P. Walker

Q. Under 2C, F and D were further apart - how far apart now?

A. Relative: "A week before, by a nose now".

Q. Can't quantify? A. No.

Q. Conclusion based not only on facts but also on interpretation and the selected process?

A. Yes (reluctantly)

Q. Calculated result(s)? A. No.

Q. Effect of EFW (if not built)?

A. Shorter life of landfill - start at Stage 1 again.
With new info., being careful to review enough of former.

Q. If ^{waste} quantities were as in Stage 2C, would F and D rank as now?

A. Can't say.

Q. Dismissing "existing constraints" (overcome by engineering), - is hydrogeology no longer a factor?

A. Not meant this way - relies on both the physiology of sites and engineering

Q. Which is physiologically better, w/o engineering considered?

A. Still preferring F.

(...3)

Feb 10 '87

Q. (Referring to a letter) -- The tech. differences have now become "policy differences" -- how?

A. - Can't answer - decided by others.

Q. Did you not carry out the critical review?

A. Yes - but...

Q. Birds are not "vermin" - ?

Did you not consider the birds a nuisance at F?

A. [A don't understand...] [Q - they peep on neighbors.]
- Not considered an impact

Q. "Perception" of impact only at D?

A. Well, ... yes.

Q. Businesses (2) new at D, but not at F

A. Found out lately at D. ("home industries")?

Q. Did you know that an industry wanted to locate at F near F (across from), but was dissuaded by Region's personnel?

A. No, didn't know.

Q. Letter no problem at F?

- Court's houses at D, but doesn't court people

A. Letter is only an ON-SITE problem. passing by Site F?

Q. High visibility at F -

A. Visual consultant gave that info. - see his report

Q. Nest, gas and odor - (a) "D and F are tied"

A. - (b) Still performing one in the end. }?

Bonney (Regional Chairman) vs. Walker

Q. Less difference betw. D & F now than at Stage 2C?

A. Yes

Q. Tech. reports & reviews C/w changes - have they any effect on the tech. reports as issued to Region?

A. Visual assessment had to rework the "height factor" in a hurry -

(Yes) any questions can be answered.

W. Johnson vs. Walker

Q. Rehabilitate a site for agriculture?

A. Need crop rotation for 10 yrs. To re-establish fertility

Q. Gas evolution a problem?

A. Can be controlled by gas collection - no

Q. Hydrogeology tested when? - recently?

A. - One year ago

Q. Highest water level in many years, now

A. - being monitored - info. is being collected.

Q. Considered that Burlington is used to the dump, but the Town of Milton is not?

A. Similar situation, although more "new" at D

Q. EFW location - does selection of D or F affect the location?

A. No, only the timing, capacity etc., not location.

Q. Putting EFW near transformer station? A. Not necessarily - may go near existing ones.

Feb 10, '87

Murray Stevens of the H.R. Conservation Authority

Q. Engineering for holding ponds and drainage channels don't comply with Provincial guidelines?

A. Should be asked of the specialist

[Chair to Walker: You should get the answer for next meeting]

Q. Cost (a) of coursting to affruse is not included.

(b) how much is it at Site F?

A. Was to be included.

[Chair to Walker: Find out and provide the answer]

Q. Ag W. Mulkewich vs. Walker

Q. Is D agricultural "prairie"?

A. No, but re-use makes sense in the area of D.

Q. Pipelines → development

A. We can't understand (leachate to sewers?) } P. Walker resists, evades.
W. Mulkewich persists, then drops it (amused).

David Ward vs. Walker

(Bur. resident, opposes F)

Q. If waste volumes are more than expected, the present problem arises again? - Site not treated independently?

A. EA is for 20 yrs., but only with the EFW in the plan. If not EFW as phased, the result is not valid any longer.

Q. 1996 target for EFW - a short time

A. The EA Hearing will address the question. (...6)

Councillor Liz Edwards vs. Walker

Q. Any other components that reduce waste in place of EFW?

A. Would have to be shown to be equivalent

(INAUDIENCE) Ald. J. Griene, Burlington (not likely)

Q. What if EFW gets hung up in procedural tangles?
- Can we get a positive answer from this EA Hearing?

A. Maybe / other solutions may become important in future (10-20 yrs.)

Q. Is it not very difficult to find an EFW site?

A. In Toronto, a commercial ^("private") proposal, if it makes sense, will get approval. - It is feasible.

Q. Will the Hearing produce a 20 yr. solution?

A. Can only hope it will.

G. Krantz (Mayor of Milton) vs. Walker

Q. Amended terms of reference - asking for (a) 1, 2 or 3 (b) 1 or 2 sites to be found ... ?

A. Was reviewed and decided by Council.

Chair to Committee:

Q. Hold evg. meetings of committees & Council?

G. Krantz Supportive - some issues to be developed at Hearing
W. Mulbeinich " " " " " " " " " "

but also Council must indicate (or attempt to)
which site is preferred (re. Mar. 4, ?)

W. Johnson: Chairman can + must call the meeting

P. Pourroy: Will do what he is asked.

Doesn't think an evg. meeting helps,
but goes along.

L. Behrens: Any conflicts with local Council agendas?
Should first find out.

W. Mulbeinich: If recommended now, gives opportunity
to clear the calendars elsewhere

J. Fleming: Bylaw obliges Chairman to call a meeting
as requested

Vote "For:" 5 - carried - EVG. meeting, MAR. 4.

OF COUNCIL (instead of daytime)

Murray Stevens, Hallau Regional Conservation Authority:

Q. Had indicated in writing that storm runoff provisions
in site engineering were inadequate (e.g. homes at D/... S)

-8-

A (Walker) [evasive]

Chair: This must be answered (letter sent 3-4 wks ago)

→ Regional Coordinator:

A Answer is on the way: "All concerns

can be easily met, acc. to the consultants,
by engineering revisions".

[Adjourned]

