

David Webb
755 Cedar Glen Rd
Dunsford, Ont, K0M 1L0

Feb 18, 2022

City of Kawartha Lakes City Council

As the Dillon Study on Future Waste Options will be presented for council receipt at council Feb 22, 2022 I thought I would share a few questions/concerns that council may wish to consider.

1. The report recommends starting an Environmental Assessment this year, expecting 10 years to complete.
 - a. That duration seems excessive.
 - i. Durham-York Energy took 5 years and they had the additional complexity of compliance with associated energy legislation.
 - ii. A sampling of Ontario EA's for landfill expansion shows an average of 3.5 years (see below)
 - iii. Landfill expansion is a far less complex EA so should take less time.
 - iv. Why the urgency to start the EA in 2022?
 - b. Perhaps staff could provide rationale for that estimate and urgency to start EA at council Feb 22.**

2. The Lindsay Ops Landfill is due to be full in 2037 – 15 years from now
 - a. The impact of Laxton and Fenelon Falls closing is said to reduce Lindsay Ops landfill life but does not state by how much.
 - b. The report mentions vertical expansion opportunities that would mitigate the impact of closing Laxton and Fenelon Falls - but provides no details as to the cost/effort.
 - c. Perhaps ask staff to provide details on the time impact of the closures and the effort/cost/time of vertical expansion to Laxton and Fenelon Falls at council Feb 22.**

3. The report declares Expanded Landfill the preferred option scoring 30 points in the evaluation versus Mass Burn's 27 points. There is a case to be made that the two options should be scored equally, or Mass Burn may be preferred by 1 point.
 - a. Operational Cost
 - i. Mass Burn through 5 Counties annual cost would be ~\$1.5m and would handle ALL of CKL waste. – increasing points from 1 to 2

- ii. Expanded landfill would have an increased annual cost of < \$1m. Added together with current operating costs of \$2.7m (which would continue), the total cost is more than \$3m decreasing their points from 3 to 2
- b. Capital Costs
 - i. The evaluation estimated \$50+ for Mass Burn, however the only way it could work is in partnership with the 5 Counties. CKL portion of the cost would be about 10% of the total or \$300m – increasing the score from 1 to 2
- c. Mass Burn is assessed as having a Nuisance score higher than landfill if at a new site.
 - i. In fact the overall nuisance factor should be no more than a landfill site. It will draw traffic and nuisance away from landfill so it really just moves the nuisance to a different location. Overall, the nuisance rating will be the same. This increases Mass Burn scoring from 1 to 2
- d. Asking staff to review the scoring as noted above and report back to council Feb 22.**

I am happy to clarify any of the above at your convenience.

Sincerely,

David Webb

Sampling of times to complete Landfill Expansion EA's (from TOR submission to Minister decision)

- Maple Lake (Haliburton)
 - 150,000 m³ expansion
 - 3.5 years
- Brighton
 - 500,000 m³
 - 4 years (Jan 2011-Feb 2015)
- Peterborough (Bensfort)
 - 25 years of volume
 - 5 years (Jan 1997-Jan 2002)
- Hanover/Walkerton
 - 347,000 m³
 - 5 years, Nov 2006-Mar 2011
- Stoney Creek
 - 3,680,000 m³
 - 2 years, Feb 2017-Jan 2019
- Eastern Ontario Waste
 - 4,200,000 m³
 - 2 years, May 2017-Mar 2019
- Brooks Road
 - 421,000 m³
 - 3.5 years, Jul 2015-Jan 2019
- Humberstone
 - 2,400,000 m³
 - 3 years, May 2013-Apr 2016
- Average of above – 3.5 years