

EX 88

SUBMISSION from Dr. C. Walker

Tues 29 May 400h.

1. Background. I have resided at 176 Rennick Road since 1972, my residence lies 700 m to the west of the landfill site and my property boundary at its closest is 200 m from the site. My property is 100 m SW of that of Mr. Aitkin.

When the landfill extension was granted in 1979, I made no objection to the proposal because it was stated to be short term and because there appeared to be no reasonable alternative.

When the present expansion was proposed by the Region of Halton, there was originally an alternative option, namely that 75% of the waste should be transferred to Niagara Falls, N.Y. for 'Energy from Waste'. After listening to the arguments debated by Burlington City Council, at which the Energy from Waste option was favoured, I indicated my support for this alternative with the corollary that I would not oppose phases A and B of the proposed expansion which would be needed for the 25% non-combustible (and non-toxic) waste until a long term site was approved.

The Region of Halton subsequently rejected the Energy for Waste option, and my support for phases A and B by themselves no longer exists.

* [~~2. General. I have read the submission of Mr. J. Aitkin and endorse without reservation the issues he raises. In addition, I would like to make the following points.~~ make the following points.

3. Noise caused by the landfill is already intrusive. The dull roar of a nearby construction site 7.30 am to 6.0 pm weekdays and 7.30 am to 4.30 pm Saturdays (K-5) can only get worse as the site rises above the tree line. Despite verbal assurances at previous meetings that the workforce would face S and E, the Dillon documents show it facing W, i.e. facing the nearby properties (Fig S9), with the existing site.
4. Visual Impact. The proposed new elevations of the site will obscure the escarpment as viewed from the south, will create an unnatural N-S ridge in a terrain whose dominant feature is the E-W edge of the escarpment, and the visual impact, unlike the short term noise nuisance, will be forever. Every effort must be made to reduce the intrusion of this unnatural hill on the natural landscape.
5. Public Health and Safety. Although my property is located uphill from the site, and sufficiently distant for my well water to be safe from pollution, I have to be concerned with the environmental hazards that are so lightly dismissed in the Dillon 'Executive Summary' (05-7 and 0-45). Chemicals that can only have come from the leachate (chlorinated hydrocarbons, cadmium (Q-24,25) have been found in the most southerly of the boreholes (BH17) and no data exists to show how far the plume has travelled off site. A cancer forming chemical, phenanthrene, is present in the leachate (Q52) at a concentration 70,000 times that known to

* Mr Aitkin was originally scheduled to make his presentation on Tues 29 May during the afternoon. His submission has been delayed to Wed 30 May. I agree with his sentiments but I cannot endorse

cause cancer (Q20). No one knows whether it is present also in the ground water of the plume since the detection limit of analysis is more than 1000 times the cancer threshold. Even the Dillon report calls this 'an interesting case' (Q-24).

Assurances that 'the existing plume' does not 'have any bearing on the proposals' (0-7) are negated by the calculations (0-57 and 0-152) that predict there will be a 10% leakage of leachate into the ground water even with the benefits of modern engineering.

A large mass of landfill resting on fractured shale on the side of a hill within view of a large body of fresh water which itself provides drinking water to most of the local population does not make environmental sense. Our concern must be that, in the absence of any way of effectively policing what is deposited, toxic waste already present or introduced in the next 4 years will create a disaster that will be beyond our power to repair. It is irresponsible to argue that increasing an environmental risk is justified because a lesser risk already exists, especially since we still have the option to desist forthwith and burn the waste material.