

Distribution, Copies of W.B.C. Group Mar 25 '85 comments
on WWY draft report "Selection of Preferred Site" - Region of Halton

1985 date

Mar. 25. M.H. Boggs, C.A.O., City of Burlington
 426 Brant St.

335-7609

Copies to all City Councillors as part of Agenda for Apr. 19 '85
City SWM Committee (appears Apr. 15.)

Mar. 24. Walter Mulrowide

" Dorothy Pocock

Jung Anderson

Alf Coome

(Mar. 25, Region of Halton / Planning & Development)

Mar. 28. CBC - Paul Kidd, Jackson Square, Ham. 528-2727
 Skelco Tower, 9th Floor

" Mr. Linda Stevens, MOE Director of Envir. Approvals Branch
 135 St. Clair Ave. W. (7th Floor), Toronto M4V 1P5

" Mr. C.E. MacIntyre, MOE Director, Project Engineering
 135 St. Clair Ave. W. (10th floor) Toronto M4V 1P5

" Hon. Mr. M.C. Kells, Minister of Environment, ~~Queen's Park~~, Toronto
 (Morley) 135 St. Clair Ave. W. (15th floor) M4V 1P5

" Hon. Mr. Frank Miller, Premier of Ont., Queen's Park, Toronto

" Mr. David Peterson, Leader of the Opposition, Queen's Park, Toronto

" Mr. Robert Rae, Leader of the Ontario NDP, " " "

" Hon. Mr. Dennis Timbrell, Minister of Munic. Aff's & Housing,
 777 Bay St. (17th Floor), Toronto M5G 2E5

" Mrs. Ann Mulvale, Chairman SWM Committee, Region of Halton
 Regional Municipality of Halton, P.O. Box 7000/1151 Bronte Rd.,
 Oakville L6J 6E1

(cont'd: Copies of WCCG "Comments")

1985 date

Mar-29. Mr. George Mierzynski, MOE Director of Western Region,
7 Overlea Blvd., Toronto M4H 1A8

" Mr. George Nelson, MOE Central Region, Oakville Office
1226 White Oaks Blvd., Oakville L6H 2B9

" Mr. Michael Singleton, Exec. Director, Feder. of Ont. Naturalists
355 Lesmill Rd., Don Mills, M3B 2W8

" Mrs. Lynn Mac Millan, Exec. Director, CONE (Coalition
on the Niagara Escarpment) 355 Lesmill Rd., Don Mills M3B 2W8

[ONLY] Short form: Press release + Overview & conclusions, delivered

Mar-28. Mr. Reg. Bullock, 3454 Cedar Springs Rd.
(Pres.) Burlington LIONS CLUB

" Mr. Doug Robertson, Exec. Dir. Bruce Trail Assoc.
1 Homestead Drive, Royal Bot. Gard.

[ONLY] Press release (incl. flyer re. April Public Meeting), delivered:

Mar-28. CHML 900 incl. CKDS Stereo 95 549-2411
848 Main St. E., Ham., L8M 1M1 (ext-38)

" CKOC 1150, 73 Garfield South, Ham., L8M 2S3
545-5222

" CHAM 2 King St. W. (Jackson Sq.), Ham., L8P 1A1, 526-1280
1280

" CHCH-TV, 163 Jackson St. W., Ham. L8P 1L7
(Newsroom 522-1797) 522-1101

" CBC, 110 King St. W. (St. Peter's, 9th fl., Jackson Sq.)
Ham. L8P 4S6 528-2727

- Copies of WBCG "Comments", draft WWY report - cont'd
1985 date
- Apr. 2. Mrs. Mary-Jane Zaeflauer, 925 Park Ave. W. 634-9395
- Apr. 8. The Spectator, 474 Brant St., Burl. (Dana Robbins)
- Apr. 4. Ms. Irene Polwiski, MOE Waste Mgt. Branch (Hydrogeology)
40 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto M4V 1M2 965-6191
- " Mr. A.P. Paterson, Dir., Royal Bot. Gardens 527-1158
640 Plains Rd. West, Burl.
- April 11. Mr. Lyle Parsons, MOE Oakville Office,
1226 White Oaks Blvd., Oakville L6H 2B9
- " Mr. Robert Elstone, Bus. 3017 New St. 637-0156
Res. RR#2 Burl. 689-6327
- " Mr. Jamie Edwards, (Bus.) 764 Guelph L. 639-5209
- " Mr. M. Stevens, Gen. Mgr. Halton Region Conservation Authority
310 Main St., Milton L9T 1P9
- " Dr. Jack Volentyne, CCIW 637-4303
- " TRIDON, % Mr. Lloyd Etherington, Sn V.P. Operations
or Mr. Laidlaw 632-8900
201 North Service Rd.
- " CUMIS, % Mr. H. Mee or Mr. H. Duffy 632-1221
151 North Service Rd.
- " Mrs. Cam Jackson (Res.) 631 Kilbirnie Place, Burl., 639-3571

(cont'd: Copies of WECC "comments")

1985 date

Apr. 11. Globe and Mail % Kevin Marron
23 Spring St., Apt. 83, Ham. 525-7845

" Toronto STAR % David Greenberg 527-3290
(no longer/will forward) - 70 Broadalbane, Ham.]

" Burlington Gazette, 496 Brant St. 639-5500

" Burlington POST, 2317 Fairview St. L7R 2E3 632-4444

" Mr. William Kemppling, MP, Constituency Office 632-0196
Upper Canada Pl., Brant St.

Apr. 14. Mr.

MPP (Lib.) candidate
Campaign Headq., Upper Canada Pl., Brant St.

Independent opponents to "Escapment Site F" (landfill)
in Burlington (April '85) Hans Kreplin

Copies of our Mar. 26. '85 comments on WWY draft report
"Selection of Preferred Site" - Region of Haldon -

April 13. '85 TO:

Dale Sutherland, 296 Merle Ave. (Biol. Chem.) 634-8213

Tom Williams, 1083 Joan Dr. 639-1665
(unlisted)

Jim Aitkin, 175 Rennick Rd. 689-6928
(waterdown No.)

Dr. Chris Walker, 176 Rennick Rd. 689-6307

David Ward, 897 Boothman Ave. 525-7126

Dr. (Prof.) Brian Bunting, 616 Morley Ave. 637-7003

"King's Court", 1159 King Rd. - Tenant, Hugh Bell 632-0125
- Owner, John Cestnick

Michael Brecht, 411 Dorchester Cresc. (Forest Technician) 637-9058

Dr. (Prof.) Ellen Baar } 706 Drury Lane 634-9773
Dr. (Prof.?) Carl Baar }

May 9. '85 Cliff Schummer, 90 Townsend Ave. East 637-5997

(attached copies of WBCG "minutes") - 6 -

WBCG and Solid Waste committee members (remainder)

Apr. B. Harold Raynham 1062 Joan Dr.

634-0690

" John Deming 1043 Maplehurst

634-1398

June McCooey 471 Plains Rd. W.

529-4363

Via Region's administration building (delivered Apr. 15)

✓ 15 Regional Councillors (Clerk: Office Mail drop)
(all, except Mrs. Ann Mulvane and all Burlington Councillors: Earlier)

Halton Hills: Mr. Russel Miller (Mayor)

Mr. Michael Armstrong

Mr. Jake Kuiken

Mr. John McDonald

Mr. Dave Whiting

Milton

Mr. Gordon Krantz (Mayor)

Mr. Brad Clements

Mr. William Johnson

Oakville

Mr. B.H. Barrett (Mayor)

Mr. Peter Arch

Mr. Keith Bird

Mrs. Jackie Cutmore

Mrs. Carol Gooding

Chairman, SWRC, Nov. 28, Mrs. Ann Mulvane ✓

Mr. Fred Oliver

Chairman

Mr. Peter Pomroy

Region
of Halton

admin. bldg.

- mail slots -

(Apr. 15, '85)

(3)

The Premier
of Ontario

Parliament Buildings
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1A1

965-9353

April 11, 1985

Dear Mr. Kreplin:

Thank you for your letter of March 14th concerning the Regional Municipality of Halton's draft landfill planning documentation.

I anticipate that the Regional Municipality will be addressing your concerns as they finalize their planning documentation prior to submitting their formal environmental assessment document to the Minister of the Environment.

The Ministry of the Environment and the other review Ministries of the Province are reviewing Halton's draft planning documentation and will be providing the Region with their comments.

The Provincial Ministries will provide a technical review of Halton's formal environmental assessment when it is submitted later this spring, and the public will have the opportunity to make submissions to the Minister of the Environment on these matters. The Environmental Assessment Act provides an opportunity for the public to request that the Minister require the Environmental Assessment Board to hold a hearing.

Once again thank you for writing and bringing your concerns to my personal attention. I am confident that the Environmental Assessment Act will ensure an adequate examination of all concerns respecting Halton's proposal.

Sincerely,



Frank S. Miller

Mr. Hans Kreplin,
510-20 Northshore West,
Burlington, Ontario

COPY

From: Hans F. Kreplin P.Eng.
510-20 Northshore Bld. W.
Burlington, Ontario, L7T 1A1

To: Halton SWMC - July 15, 1985.

Re. C.A.O. Report 203/85 p.5, numbered item (30) :

"F & D epitomizes some of the central issues".

- landfill on shale or on a till plain?
- does one of them require a liner, the other not?
- is one affordable and the other not?

Add to that the questions of required capacity, access to existing sources of pollution, the urban area, and so on.

The obvious answer is that site F is simply not suitable. The Region would throw good money and effort after bad by continuing with site F.

I suspect that most of Council and staff would now agree, but you and they hesitate to admit it publicly by eliminating site F. If that is really an issue, let me assure you that the public will have little respect for those who want to merely save face and will have greater respect for those who face the facts as they are. There is nothing wrong with changing direction for good reason, but there is plenty wrong with flogging a dead horse.

The time has come to get it right, and here are a number of other recommendations to do that. I should emphasize though, that I adopt a regional viewpoint rather (than) speaking parochially.

1. While site F should be dropped, site E should not be dropped at this time. To do so would leave Milton wide open to the OWMC, and the Region would be disloyal to one of its municipalities.

Site A could still be included, too, until a clearer view emerges from further studies which sites are least promising.

SWM-65-85

Copy of H. Kreplin's Presentation to Regional SWMC on July 15/85

- 2 -

6. Although CAO Report 203/85 sets out to complete preparations for a hearing in minimum time, its recommendations have several flaws which could cause the plan to fail.
- 6.1 The great number of separate consultants to be engaged makes their co-ordination difficult. the proposed control of the project by not only 1 but 2 staff committees, Direction Committee (ADC) and a Management Committee (AMC) is not only cumbersome, but there would be no one specifically responsible. For most effective co-ordination and direction there should be only one person in charge and first establish terms of reference.
- 6.2 Hydrology Consultants did not produce acceptable work to date and should not be retained again for the larger scope of all the key subjects: Hydrogeology/geology/geochemistry/geophysics/shale resource analysis, plus participation in Operations and Design.
- 6.3 No provision is made for further work on the social impact.
- 6.4 Cultural impact is not included, as before. This relates to present culture as opposed to that of the past.
- 6.5 The great number of consultants proposed in C.A.O 203/85 would make the scope for each rather narrow, but at the same time there is no provision for maintaining the larger perspective and generating an evaluation and overview. This should be an ongoing activity, if only for keeping Council informed in more than detailed technical terms.
- 6.6 More use can be made of existing knowledge and expertise in studying the sites and/or special subjects, such as university departments and national or provincial institutions, whether governmental or not, e.g. the C.C.I.W. or Environment Canada could likely play a better role.

Copy of H. Kreplin's Presentation to Regional SWMC on July 15/85

- 3 -

- 9.2 The Region has failed to meter the flow of leachate from the collection drains during all of 1984. This amounts to serious neglect in monitoring the site. If that meter cannot be made to work, another ought to be installed. Based on the problems reported in previous years, two or three meters will be needed to obtain a reasonable continuity in these flow data.
- 9.3 #17 borehole is to be (or has already been) sealed. the location downhill from the landfill's centreline and closest to the North Service Road is particularly important to determine offsite leachate migration. This borehole should be left intact, or else a replacement must be installed. The report is silent on that question.
- 9.4 The monitoring report fails to calculate the landfill's water balance (i.e. what goes in and out). The Region's consultant should be asked to provide such elementary data.
- 9.5 The monitoring consultant proposes to eliminate sampling from deeper locations that have shown high chemical concentrations in the past. That is completely unacceptable. The reason given is merely a hypothesis, and the opinion that such analyses are useless is premature. The SWMC should instruct the consultant to provide the complete facts.
- 9.6 The monitoring report shows no data on leachate breakouts ("springs") through the cover. Since the Region is obliged to log the data, they should be reported as well, and the SWMC should request them.
- 9.7 A number of monitoring wells have been reported as damaged or destroyed. Their analyses have been or will be eliminated. The fact that the locations affected are among the most important ones for indicating the difference between uphill and downhill groundwater quality is possibly coincidence but is most unfortunate for the purpose of monitoring. Immediate repair or

Background

(5)

HALTON LANDFILL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

SUMMARY OF THE PROCESS

1. SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL IN HALTON

- . Halton produces 185,000 tonnes of garbage for disposal each year and this will climb as the population grows in the years ahead
- . Halton was given responsibility in 1974 for solid waste disposal - 6 landfill sites were in place at that time - 3 closed down in 1974 and 3 stayed open (Georgetown, Oakville, Burlington)
- . Georgetown landfill site closed in 1979
- . Oakville and Burlington sites reached capacity in 1980 but were extended by an "Interim Plan #1"
- . Oakville site was closed in 1982
- . In July 1984, the existing capacity of the Burlington landfill site was reached and Interim Plan #2 approval was issued by the Ministry of the Environment so that four additional areas could be landfilled. One of these four areas is almost filled to capacity. In September/October 1985, landfilling will commence in the second area and later carry on into the third area until approximately March/April 1987. The last area is expected to be filled by September, 1987.
- . Interim Plan #3 an Energy From Waste Plan, was implemented in February of 1985. This plan consists of the haulage of 51,000 tonnes to the Occidental Chemical Corporation Energy From Waste Plant in Niagara Falls, New York.

2. WALKER WRIGHT YOUNG ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY

The Dillon Years

- . in 1975 M.M. Dillon Associates Ltd. undertook a two part study dealing with:
 - 1) Sanitary Landfill
 - 2) Resource Recovery
- . in February 1976, 11 sites were identified in the Resource Recovery Report which recommended Stage 1 hydrogeological investigations at 6 sites

Old Site "F" - Milton

- . old site "F" in Milton was the best site from the hydrogeological stand point
- . Phase II drilling at old site "F" was positive

(!) →

Halton council seeks emergency dump

HAMILTON
SPECTATOR
JUNE 21/84
P.A7

By MICHAEL BENNETT
Spectator Staff

AN EMERGENCY expansion of the Aldershot dump is being sought by Halton council.

Council voted yesterday to ask the provincial environment ministry to grant an emergency certificate allowing the region to put more trash in the North Service Road dump.

The dump had not been expected to reach capacity until the end of August, but recent tests found that it will be full by the middle or end of July.

An environmental hearing board is now considering a four-phase expansion to the dump requested by Halton council, but that process is not expected to be complete before the end of July.

The Aldershot dump is Halton's last landfill site and council expects the four-phase expansion will serve the region until a permanent dump is opened in 1988.

At the suggestion of regional staff, council also voted to recommend that the emergency expansion proceed in an area designated as phase A of the full-scale expansion.

That proposal, however, drew objections from Burlington Alderman Walter Mulkewich, who said it would be safer to expand a different section of the dump.

Underground

Phase A lies over the oldest part of the existing dump on an area of fractured shale that has no underdrain sys-

tem, he said.

In place of a phase A expansion, Mr. Mulkewich proposed an expansion to an area designated as phase C — the newest part of the dump and an area with a full underdrain system.

"In view of the serious leachate plume that is there now the region should show it is willing to go with the area that will give the greatest amount of safety to the homes there," Mr. Mulkewich said.

The leachate plume to which he referred extends underground from the now-closed Bayview dump, which lies next to the Aldershot landfill site.

The exact size of the plume — and whether it contains dangerous contaminants — has yet to be determined.

Burlington Mayor Roly Bird said he would object to a recommendation for a phase C expansion in place of phase A.

In the past, Burlington council has expressed concerns about some areas of the full-scale expansion — but always maintained that phase A was acceptable.

The final decision on which — if any — part of the dump, and how much of it is expanded, will be up to the environment ministry.

Mr. Mulkewich also made an unsuccessful bid to have regional staff open talks with a trucking firm in St. Catharines for the transport of the region's trash to an energy-from-waste plant in Niagara Falls, N.Y.

Halton council has already rejected that alternative as economically impractical.

Halton council seeks emergency dump

HAMILTON
SPECTATOR
JUNE 21/84
P.A7

By MICHAEL BENNETT
Spectator Staff

AN EMERGENCY expansion of the Aldershot dump is being sought by Halton council.

Council voted yesterday to ask the provincial environment ministry to grant an emergency certificate allowing the region to put more trash in the North Service Road dump.

The dump had not been expected to reach capacity until the end of August, but recent tests found that it will be full by the middle or end of July.

An environmental hearing board is now considering a four-phase expansion to the dump requested by Halton council, but that process is not expected to be complete before the end of July.

The Aldershot dump is Halton's last landfill site and council expects the four-phase expansion will serve the region until a permanent dump is opened in 1988.

At the suggestion of regional staff, council also voted to recommend that the emergency expansion proceed in an area designated as phase A of the full-scale expansion.

That proposal, however, drew objections from Burlington Alderman Walter Mulkewich, who said it would be safer to expand a different section of the dump.

Underground

Phase A lies over the oldest part of the existing dump on an area of fractured shale that has no underdrain sys-

tem, he said.

In place of a phase A expansion, Mr. Mulkewich proposed an expansion to an area designated as phase C — the newest part of the dump and an area with a full underdrain system.

"In view of the serious leachate plume that is there now the region should show it is willing to go with the area that will give the greatest amount of safety to the homes there," Mr. Mulkewich said.

The leachate plume to which he referred extends underground from the now-closed Bayview dump, which lies next to the Aldershot landfill site.

The exact size of the plume — and whether it contains dangerous contaminants — has yet to be determined.

Burlington Mayor Roly Bird said he would object to a recommendation for a phase C expansion in place of phase A.

In the past, Burlington council has expressed concerns about some areas of the full-scale expansion — but always maintained that phase A was acceptable.

The final decision on which — if any — part of the dump, and how much of it is expanded, will be up to the environment ministry.

Mr. Mulkewich also made an unsuccessful bid to have regional staff open talks with a trucking firm in St. Catharines for the transport of the region's trash to an energy-from-waste plant in Niagara Falls, N.Y.

Halton council has already rejected that alternative as economically impractical.

Hearing ends

Residents fighting for conditions

By ROY SANGER

Aldershot residents didn't give up their opposition to landfilling in general, but by the end of the Burlington landfill hearings, they were willing to accept the two or three-year extension of the Burlington dump with a few provisos.

Although the West Burlington Ratepayers' Group had opposed continued use of the site, its attorney Rob Timberg, in closing arguments Tuesday, said the group had no choice but to accept the opinion of Kevin Ridley, a hydrogeology expert it had hired, that con-

tinued dumping over large portions of the site could be done without unreasonable environmental damage.

Citizen's group acquiescence means all parties to the hearing support the extension until a permanent site is settled on, but conditions for the approval, and staging of the four-part extension remained at issue.

While the Region asked that its stages A, B, C, and D be followed in that order, Timberg said the citizen's group wants A, which is over-existing landfill area, left to the end because there

are too many unknowns.

"As Ridley pointed out, that landfill site should not have been there in the first place in an unengineered state," Timberg said.

The citizens would prefer starting the extension in the areas where under-drains will be installed to collect about 90 per cent of the leachate produced by the landfill.

But Douglas Hodgson, representing the Region, said the weight of the evidence at the hearing indicated there was no risk to adding to the landfill over unengineered areas because the leachate has no opportunity to migrate from the shale formations to the surface water systems.

The whole question of staging, however, may end up out of the hearing panel's hands if the Region has to ask for an emergency operating certificate before a recommendation is made.

Current projections call for the landfill site to be filled in July, which could be prior to the Environmental Assessment Board finalizing its recommendation to the ministry's approvals director.

In that case, the director may be forced into a decision that could be counter to the board's recommendations. "The director may do something that will frustrate this board," hearing chairman M. Eisen

pointed out. "I have some difficulty with the whole question of the emergency certificate."

Timberg asked for other conditions, most of which could be completed within months, he said, and which had to do in general with what Ridley saw as a lack of information on the leachate problem at the landfill site.

The background water quality should be determined, the leachate chemistry accurately analyzed so the extent of any problem is known and an accurate mapping of the creeks done to identify any shale outcroppings where leachate could potentially escape into the surface water systems.

Also, stung by this extension request after being promised a 1980 extension was to be the last, Aldershot residents pressed for conditions attached to the approval that would make it impossible for any further landfilling at that site, have citizens on the committee to oversee operations, and have the Region prepare contingency plans in case it is still caught up in the environmental assessment process when this extension runs out.

Hodgson, though, argued the requests should not be imposed as conditions, either because the Region had promised to do them, or they were unnecessary, since the risks from the leachate were

non-existent. He also pointed out the current expansion plan would take the site to its limits for acceptance of garbage so it can never be extended again.

The Region agreed with six of seven city conditions regarding setbacks, contingency plans, monitoring of the leachate problem, finding the extent of the leachate plume and remedying it, preparing a biophysical survey, and consultation with the City on engineering and after-use plans.

Hodgson asked that a seventh condition, having the Region tie in leachate control systems for the Burlington site with the nearby Bayview site, be rejected.

The ministry of environment also asked for conditions, most of them rewritten versions of the existing certificate of approval but on daily operation, type of waste received.

The environmental assessment hearing panel will now review all the evidence presented at the four-week hearing and prepare a recommendation accepting or rejecting continued landfilling and setting out conditions if it approves it. That recommendation goes to the full board, which will make its recommendation to the approvals director.

Eisen said he hoped to have his recommendation ready by mid to late July.

- . Council approved proceeding with the required approvals in 1977:
 - 1) Planning - Official Plan, By-law
 - 2) Environmental - Environmental Protection Act
 - 3) Financial - Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)
- . February 1980 - The OMB and the Provincial Cabinet gave financial approval to old Site F in Milton
- . June 1980 - The Environmental Assessment Act became applicable to municipal projects
- . February 1981 - Minister of the Environment ordered Halton to complete an EA before environmental approval could be given
- . the year of 1981 was spent trying to get funding for the EA
- . beginning of 1982, the EA process was started

3. THE ONTARIO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT (E.A.A.)

Purpose - "to cause proponents (the Region) of undertakings to carry out early in the planning process, a comprehensive study to determine the likely environmental and social effects of the proposed undertaking, to consider alternatives to it, as well as provide opportunities for the public to provide directional input and to comment on the undertaking, including whether or not it ought to proceed."

- . the E.A.A. provides for an approvals process which must be completed before projects are started or before they receive any other legally required approvals or government financing.

4. THE WALKER WRIGHT YOUNG ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY

- . Proposal call for Consultants - February to September 1982
- . Council approved the consulting firm of Walker Wright Young Associates Ltd. (WWY) to complete Halton's Landfill Component Environmental Assessment (September, 1982)
- . The EA was divided into 3 phases:
 - Phase I Work Program
 - Phase II Stage 1 - Waste Needs and Systems Analysis
 - Stage 2 - Site Selection
 - Phase III EA Preparation

Phase I Work Program

- . Draft Work Program circulated to the public, municipalities and agencies (Sept. 1982)
- . Revised Work Program circulated
- . Final Work Program approved by Council in June, 1983.

Public Participation

- . Ministry of the Environment has advised:

"During the planning process culminating in the preparation of the environmental assessment document, the proponent is strongly advised to involve the public...The proponent is likely to be on firmer ground if evidence can be presented of previous consultation with those likely to be affected by the undertaking or its alternatives"

- . at each stage of the EA process, the Region has involved the public through a series of public meetings, public information centres, workshops, letters, and advertisements in several newspapers.

Phase II Stage I - Waste Needs and Systems Analysis

- . WWY looked at existing waste management system and waste quantities
- . through the use of population projections, and waste per capita, WWY projected the range of waste quantities
- . WWY also evaluated different alternative systems such as
 - 1) resource recovery
 - 2) incineration
 - 3) export
 - 4) Energy from Waste (EFW)
 - 5) landfill
- . WWY recommended 75% EFW/25% landfill subject to further EFW exploration
- . Council directed that EFW options be further explored and council appointed a Staff Task Force for this purpose.

Phase II Stage 2 - Site Selection

- 1) Phase 2 Stage 2A - General Overview Analysis - WWY
 - . 55 sub-candidate sites and 7 quarry areas were identified for further study

- 2) Phase 2 Stage 2B - Detailed Site Comparison & Multi-Site vs Single Site Comparison - WWY
 - . search was narrowed to 6 Candidate Sites
 - . single site approach recommended
 - . May 1984, Council approved Stage 2B reports including single site approach
- 3) EFW Preliminary Study - Staff Task Force and Consultants
 - . September 1984 - Council directed that the option for waste disposal in Halton should be 100% landfill for the first 8 years of the planning period (1988- 1996) and 50% landfill 50% EFW for the remaining 12 years of the planning period (2008).
- 4) Phase 2 Stage 2C - Preferred Site Evaluation - WWY
 - . June 1985 - WWY ranked 6 Candidate sites in Halton for landfill purposes - from most preferred to least preferred and chose best Site Plan Area on each Site:
 1. F.
 2. D.
 3. A-E
 5. B
 6. C

5. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

- . Staff Report for Council consideration CAO 203/85
- . July 15, 1985 - SWMC formulates recommendation to Council
- . July 23, 1985 - Special Regional Council Meeting to consider the SWMC recommendation, Preferred Site and the Approvals Approach arising out of the Final Stage 2C reports the Staff Report CAO 203/85 and other Submissions

Approvals Necessary

- . approvals necessary in order to establish Halton's new landfill component are fourfold:
 - 1) Environmental Assessment Act Approval
 - 2) Environmental Protection Act Approval
 - 3) Planning Approval
 - 4) Financial Approval under the Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The Undertaking/Preferred Site

- . Regional staff CAO Report 203/85 are suggesting that the detailed approval studies and applications be made with respect to 2 sites i.e. Site F and Site D to landfill 11.3 million cubic yards of solid waste by one of three methods (1) at F or (2) at D or (3) a portion of each of F and D and that Council defer its choice of a preferred method until after detailed studies on F and D are completed

Public Hearings in Front of Hearing Board (EAB & OMB)

- . Preliminary Hearing likely - May/June 1986
- . Final Hearing likely - September 1986