Councillor David Braden chaired the meeting and called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. There was not a quorum, however the public delegations were heard.

1. **Welcome from Chair**

   Councillor David Braden welcomed those in attendance and introduced the Councillors, Citizen Committee members, and staff who were in attendance.

2. **Presentation on Preferred Waste Disposal System**

   David Merriman of MacViro Consultant’s Inc. made a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the Consultant’s conclusion on the Preferred Disposal system.

   Stephen Plaice of Jacques Whitford Limited provided an overview of the Environmental Assessment Process that was followed in arriving at this preferred waste disposal system.

   Hard copies of the presentation were circulated and a copy is attached hereto as Appendix A.

3. **Registered Speakers:**

   1. Daniel Rodrigues, 11 Billington Crescent, Hamilton

      (submission attached)
4. Speakers not previously Registered:

2. Trevor Hayhurst, 32 East 9th Street, Hamilton
   (submission attached)

3. Dr. Ian Rowe, P.Eng, 44 Bluelagoon Drive, Mount Hope
   Ian Rowe provided a brief history of his experience as an Engineer in building incinerators.
   The Engineering firm that he worked for was close to finalizing an agreement to build an incinerator in Winnipeg when a large parcel of land with a clay base was discovered in the vicinity of the City and the Council decided to build a landfill instead as it would be cheaper.
   In Ottawa, the proposal to build an incinerator was jeopardized by the Chair of the Engineering Committee who disputed the proposed location and when the area near the airport was suggested as an alternative location it didn’t meet certain criteria and the proposal was eventually quashed.
   In Oakville, the proposal was to build an incinerator near the Ford Plant. The residents threatened to boycott Ford products and the proposal was quashed.
   In the Regional Municipality of Peel an incinerator was approved and built.
   Toronto staff insisted in the 1980’s that there was plenty of land for landfills. They prevented the report proposing an incinerator from appearing before Council.
   Dr. Rowe indicated that he is familiar with the incineration processes used in other countries. He noted that Japan has an interesting system. He advised that each small district in the country is required to eliminate waste internally. Incineration is used and because it is confined to a small area, the transportation costs are lower and power from the incinerator generates hydro for the local residents.
   European cities use larger facilities and hot water distribution systems. They are situated close to potential thermal loads which save on transportation costs and provide district heating. The emissions are low as European/German technologies are used.

4. Joseph Campanelli, 27 Sunrise Crescent, Dundas
   Mr. Campanelli indicated that he supports burning garbage. He suggests that the location should have access to proper road facilities and the Municipality of Haldimand should be invited to participate with a proposal that the ash resulting from the incineration be transported to the gypsum mines in Caledonia. He also suggests tying the incinerator right into the hydro grid.
   Mr. Campanelli indicated that he worked at SWARU and stated that the operators of SWARU didn’t follow the rules and that’s why there was so much air pollution generated from that facility.
   In his opinion, landfills emit pollutants and are covered in rats.
   He stated that Algonquin Hydro produces enough hydro to supply 7000 homes and the ash is used in road construction.

5. Don McLean, 68-151 Gateshead Crescent, Stoney Creek
Mr. McLean indicated that he hasn’t had the time to read the whole report but wishes to make a few comments.

He indicated that he has been involved in the Environmental Assessment process and teaches EA at McMaster University.

In his opinion, this EA process is flawed. It is a mistake to choose the technology before all the information is in.

Furthermore, municipalities are not in a position to solve the waste problem. The onus should be put on the producers of waste. The senior levels of government need to require that the producers of waste deal with the issue by eliminating packaging. The municipalities are dealing with this in isolation when the Province should be dealing with it by enacting the necessary legislation.

If the Province enacts legislation that would cut back on the amount of waste generated, then the capacity of existing incinerators will be too large.

Also, incineration may discourage recycling. In his opinion, one of the reasons why Hamilton lagged behind in implementing recycling is because of SWARU.

He recommends that the landfill option should remain open together with the incinerator option. The public will become involved when the location is being determined. The EA process should be a one stage process not a two stage process.

The air shed in Hamilton is compromised and regulations may become stricter after an incinerator is built and that incinerator will be required to meet the new standards. This is what caused the demise of SWARU.

6. Barry Lovegrove, P. O. Box 3, Millgrove

Mr. Lovegrove asked staff to confirm that 10 megawatts from incinerator energy will provide energy for 17,000 houses and only a little bit of natural gas would be required at the start up.

Magnets could be used to remove metals and residents of halfway houses can be employed, at a decent rate of pay, to rake away aluminum and other metals that cannot be removed using magnets.

Considering the cost efficiency of providing energy from an incinerator vs the cost of running a nuclear power plant, the Government of Ontario may decide to build several incinerators across the Province.

7. Nan Uzbalis, 22 Kopperfield Lane, Mount Hope

Mrs. Uzbalis expressed her concerns with the cost of the proposal and with the $5,000,000 required for the planning process. She questioned why the City of Hamilton, which is already $49,000,000 in debt, would be considering spending more money. All of this will be a burden to the tax payer.

8. John Bacher, 34 Church Street, St. Catharines

John Bacher indicated that he will speak at tomorrow night’s public meeting and will provide a written submission.

He indicated that he disagrees with the consultant’s report. He agreed with the previous speaker (Trevor Hayhurst) that the harmful metals should be removed prior to
incineration, not from the ash after incineration. This will have negative environmental consequences. In his opinion, the consultants are concerned with costs.

He also disagrees with the consultant’s data analysis. He said that data from different systems shouldn’t be mixed as this will not produce a clear statement.

In his opinion, option 2b was selected as the preferred option because of the cost. It is wrong to combine 4 different technologies as 2a, 2b, 2c and 2d. He expressed concerns that all of this money has been spent and there are fundamental mathematical errors in the report.

Incineration has problems with reliability and he is pointing out the flaw in the logic of the report. He will submit something in writing at tomorrow night’s public meeting.

In response, the consultants indicated that their findings are based on the assumption that there will be a high level of recycling prior to incineration.

9. Andrew Schaafsma, 1057 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton

Mr. Schaafsma advised that he lives on the Hamilton Beach strip. Although, it is one of the City’s jewels the residents are subjected to emissions from Dofasco, Stelco and Butimar. They had been reassured by Butimar that there would be no odour emanating from the plant, however there is. The residents call the MOE to complain and the MOE staff come down, take their air quality measurements but don’t take any further action. The City has been cleaning up the beach strip, however, the air quality needs cleaning too.

10. Dr. Ian Rowe, P.Eng, 44 Bluelagoon Drive, Mount Hope 9 (for a second time)

Dr. Rowe indicated that he wished to speak for a second time to address the concerns of Mrs. Uzbalis with respect to the costs.

He suggested that if the facility will generate enough revenue, then it is possible for it to be privately funded. An efficiency of 80% to 90% would be required. Long term contracts are attractive to banks for loan purposes. When he was in the business, he and his associates presented proposals that were clear and indicated all construction costs and profits and projected revenues for up to 30 years.

He also suggested supplying free heat to the local residents.

Councillor Braden asked if there were any further speakers. As no one came forward, he thanked the public for their input and adjourned the meeting. The time was 8:55 p.m.