

Question #	Verbatim Comments	Evaluation	Site	Source	Survey #
	<p>Thank you for coordinating the public presentation on "the City of Toronto's proposal to construct a new facility to process the City's green bin organic material" held on Wednesday April 4, 2007 at the Malvern Community Centre. Thank you also for asking the Morningside Heights Residents Association to provide you with written input into this process.</p> <p>As you know, some members of the Morningside Heights Residents Association attended and spoke at the meeting, more of us have submitted very well-thought out ideas and strong feelings about the potential plan, and even more of the residents in the community are opposed to the proposal.</p> <p>The Morningside Heights Residents Association is opposed to the construction of a green bin processing facility at 3301 Markham Road. Please find below some of the reasons why we have adopted this position.</p> <p>1) the City has insufficient traffic flow data to make an informed decision about selecting the proposed site; the traffic flow data regarding Markham Road is based on 2003 data and was used in the public presentation held at the Malvern Community Centre on Wednesday April 4, 2007; the 2003 data used is reflective of traffic flow prior to tens of thousands of people inhabiting several thousands of new homes, construction of two new schools, the massive Landmark retail development, the Marketplace at Steeles retail development, the development of several subdivisions on the north side of Steeles in Markham, and the development of several subdivisions on the south side of Steeles which necessitated the creation of the Morningside Heights Residents Association</p> <p>2) the future amount of traffic flow on Markham Road and Steeles is unknown; the traffic generated from vehicles traveling to and from the proposed site would be in addition to significant traffic generated from the Landmark Development which is purported to be the largest retail development in the GTA</p> <p>3) the intersection of Markham Road and Steeles Avenue is a gateway entry into the City of Toronto; selecting the proposed site is not consistent with what is usually seen at gateway entries to major cities; The Town of Markham has established a park, playscape, fountain and gazebo structure on their side of</p>		Markham		

	<p>this gateway entry</p> <p>4) the Morningside Heights area will experience an increase in traffic flow if the Markham bypass is approved</p> <p>5) the site can be used as a "transportation node" for commuters from 905 region to link with TTC to lessen the need for the Markham</p> <p>6) Markham Road cannot safely accommodate additional vehicular traffic that would be generated by City trucks, staff vehicles and contractor vehicles</p> <p>7) Steeles Avenue cannot safely accommodate additional vehicular traffic that would be generated by City trucks, staff vehicles and contractor vehicles</p> <p>8) the Markham Road and Steeles Avenue intersection cannot safely accommodate changes in traffic patterns that would occur as a result of vehicles moving in and out of the intersection in order to travel to and from the proposed site</p> <p>9) proper design, construction and operation of the proposed site at this time is not possible since there is much uncertainty about the variables that govern these items; to be sure, the unresolved issue of the Markham bypass and the effect it would have on traffic flow and patterns on Markham Road and Steeles Avenue presents significant uncertainty about the future impact on road construction, road design, environmental impact, social impact, and economic impact on the area in which the proposed site is located; these variables could easily jeopardize the viability, sustainability, and proper functioning of the proposed facility</p> <p>10) selecting the proposed site would have an adverse impact on the future of restaurants and stores which will be built adjacent to the site; the Markham Road and Steeles Avenue corridor along with the Tapscott Road and Passmore Avenue corridor are increasingly important commercial and industrial areas; for example, a Super Wal Mart is slated for development on the south-west quadrant of Markham Road and Steeles Avenue along with a Lowes Home Building Store (one of the first stores by the American company in Canada); also, Market Place East is slated to be developed as a 'food and</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>restaurant' heavy site; the impact of a green bin organic processing facility would have negative impacts on these other developments; by placing a green bin processing facility at this site the city will negatively impact these important tax revenue and job creation sites; this will of course severely impact the future Tapscott Road and Passmore Avenue business corridor and the opportunity to attract higher end businesses</p> <p>11) selecting the proposed site is contrary to the City's own stated criteria of "maximizing use of existing property assets"; while it is recognized that the proposed site is on City-owned land, the other sites have both land and facilities (e.g., property assets) already constructed and could much more easily be added onto</p> <p>12) selecting the proposed site is contrary to the City's own stated criteria of "can be developed quickly" since the other four sites are already zoned appropriately to allow an expansion of existing facilities</p> <p>13) selecting the proposed site is contrary to the City's own stated criteria of "minimizing annual system costs" since it would cost more to design, construct and operate a stand-alone, independent facility compared to operating expanded facilities at the other four existing sites</p> <p>14) all other sites can be expanded to accommodate the 27 500 tonnes per year of organic material as stated at the public consultation session by the presenter</p> <p>15) there is already a low-level radioactive material on a site on Passmore Avenue with which the Morningside Heights community is living</p> <p>16) Rouge Valley has already served as Toronto's dump from 1965-1985 at the Beare Landfill and Rouge Valley area taxpayers are committed to and continually involved in restoring the site (e.g., MHRA's Earth Day community planting of 1,000 trees at the Beare Wetland on April 21, 2007)</p> <p>17) the site is prime retail land that the City could lease and receive a revenue stream</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>18) selecting the proposed site is contrary to the City's own stated criteria of wanting to "optimize efficiency by integrating new organic processing facilities into [the] City's existing waste management system" (source: panel 6 displayed at public consultation meeting at Malvern Community Centre on April 4, 2007 which was also printed and distributed to attendees);the proposed site is the only site of five sites that is not either an active or formerly active site; the proposed site could, therefore, not be considered to be more efficient than existing sites to integrate into the City's existing waste management system</p> <p>19) Scarborough already has an existing facility at 401/Morningside; another facility in Scarborough is not needed nor would this constitute an equitable distribution of waste management facilities</p> <p>20) selecting the proposed site is contrary to the City's own stated criteria of "minimizes use of land suitable for other purposes"; the proposed site could be used to accommodate a much needed community and recreation centre; Scarborough has the most youth in the City yet it has the least number of community centres; more specifically, Scarborough has the greatest population of youth aged 0 - 19 in the City of Toronto (154 165 or 27%) yet we have the least amount of community centres in the City of Toronto (32 centres or 20%); contrastingly, Etobicoke has slightly fewer youth (151 390 or 27%) yet it has 50 community centres (or 32%) (source: Community First Toronto, September 2006) (population figures based on 2001 census data); this discrepancy is magnified in 2007 since approximately many thousands of residents have been added to the Morningside Heights area alone which has necessitated the planning for three elementary schools</p> <p>21) the City could trade 3301 Markham Road to help acquire the Village Securities Ltd. site; the present owners of the Village Securities site are willing to sell this land and trade for other land; Village Securities Ltd. would more than likely be willing to secure the 3301 Markham Road site since it is prime land for retail development; these two sites could swap ownership (Village Securities Ltd. secures 3301 Markham Road and the City secures the Village Securities Ltd. site); this would allow the City to provide a much needed site for a community centre at a reduced cost; the demand for the site is seen especially when noting that each individual dwelling in Ward 42 yields 0.75 student aged children (age 5 – 19 years old) (source: Community First Toronto, The State of</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>Toronto's Schools – 2006/07 School Capacity Utilization – “Status Inadequate and Still No Action”, March 2007)</p> <p>In conclusion, the Morningside Heights Residents Association would like the City to recognize that while we support green bin organics processing, the proposed site is not an optimum use of City-owned land for this purpose when all the disadvantages of the location are considered and the fact remains that there is a shortage of City-owned land for other much-needed facilities to serve our growing population. We value the opportunity to be part of this process and trust that these considerations will be added to your report.</p>				
	<p>Further to our discussion at the March 22/07 “Open House”, I have the following immediate questions. I would also add that this type of “open house” forum is very ‘one way’, in that it allows you to present your message, but does not allow for the public’s input.</p> <p>1. Your mandate, as passed by City Council, specifically dictates that if “some or all of the available site area is zoned residential” it be excluded for further consideration. It does not say if it is poor residential land it can be considered, and it does not provide leeway for judgement. <u>If it is zoned residential (and it is) then it is to be excluded for further consideration.</u></p> <p>The question is: by what authority, or whose authorization, is it being still considered?</p> <p>2. Your own documents indicate seven (7) trucks a day, inbound, five (5) days a week, for 55,000 tonne per year. This requires that each truck carry a load of about 70,000 lbs.; is this correct? Is Morningside Ave. capable of handling this load, and are half-load restrictions ever in effect for this area? What is the maximum number of truck loads on any one day?</p> <p>3. Is this site being considered for the small-scale demonstration facility using ATAD technology?</p>		Morningside		14

	<p>4. You indicate that the process produces combustible methane (potentially explosive) and this will be used to power an engine or turbine to produce electricity for the “grid”. Am I correct in assuming that this gas, in order to deliver it uniformly to the engine/turbine will have to be compressed and this will require an explosive gas compression station?</p> <p>a) Also, how do you dispose of the methane when the grid does not require electric input, or, when the turbine/engine is offline for service?</p> <p>b) At any time ever, will methane gas be released into the atmosphere in any amount, small or large?</p> <p>c) Is there a code or statute regulating the amount of methane that can be released to the atmosphere?</p> <p>d) Your release states “may” generate power using the methane. This is vague...either it will generate power or it will not. If not, what will be done with the methane? Released to atmosphere? Compressed for use elsewhere? Routed through the Bio Filters? How many tons of methane will be produced, and will if treated, or refined, before being used in an engine? Methane is a “greenhouse” gas – how will the atmosphere be protected?</p> <p>5. You keep referring to the “land fill site” (Morningside) but in actual fact is not, this plant is being located on property North of the land fill location on undisturbed ground that has nothing to do with the landfill site, residential zoned property, that could be developed for housing, which would become prime land with the actual land fill area being a grassland.</p> <p>6. The Dufferin site, 35 Vanley Crescent, currently has an open application Ministry of Environment, Certificate of Approval, submitted June 2003, and not approved to date. Ref # 6385-5N8SLK. What is this for and why has it not been approved?</p> <p>7. How tall is the tallest building? How tall are the Bio Filters? What is the total square feet of all the structures?</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>8. Do the Bio Filters ever need to be recharged or regenerated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Is there a back-up system in the event of breakdown?- The Bio Filters depend on blowers (fans) to move air through them; are there back-up units for the blowers?- Are the Bio Filters open to the atmosphere on top? <p>9. Your circular states green bin and <u>other organic materials</u> will flow in. What are the other organic materials?</p> <p>10. For each tonne of garbage input how much:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Methane will be produced?b) Methane will be released to the atmosphere?c) Carbon Dioxide is released to the atmosphere?d) organic material out put for further processing? <p>I am sure the community will be very interested in your reply.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--