

INTRODUCTION

Good morning. My name is Nadia Heyd. I am a stakeholder in decisions about the Highland Creed Treatment Plant, as I live nearby. I have 3 big questions.

A. Will the Fluidized Bed Incinerators (which I'll refer to as FBI's) go far enough towards reducing pollution?

Point – I've read the Staff reports and attachments and have made sense of them to the best of my ability. Of the 2 main options studied deeply – FBIs vs. trucking solids out for land application or landfill, FBI *looks like* the best solution **FOR NOW**.

Evidence – The reports included calculations and projections which indicate that **FOR NOW** the environmental, social, and economic benefits will be higher by installing a FBI. However, the reports also identified that the standards set out by the US Environmental Protection Agency are **MUCH MORE STRINGENT** than the results we can expect from the Fluidized Beds. The reports minimize the possibility that Ontario would be employing such stringent standards between now and 2020.

Point But can we be sure of that? We have 2 elections right around the corner. Why say that standards won't get higher sooner rather than later? And don't we expect the FBIs to last a long time...on the order of 40 years? Let's set aside "regulated emissions standards" for just a moment...Don't we want emissions to be reduced **AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE** for our health, and the health of future generations?

I appreciate the urgency of doing *something* to upgrade the Multiple Hearth Incinerators at Highland Creek Treatment plant. However, if we install FBIs, we are making a choice to commit huge financial resources towards a technology that may or *may not* meet our future needs. I would ask the committee to be more forward thinking, and as much as possible, build a facility or use a process or technology that will be able to meet the highest pollution control goals possible. The report says cost isn't the most important factor: Environmental protection and Social factors were weighted at 80% of the "triple bottom line" while economics weighed in at 20%. Let's think about the future at least as much as we are thinking about the present.

B. What are the Committee's plans for Monitoring and Reporting to the Public?

Point I applaud Toronto Water for, in recent years making its Annual Reports for all 4 of its Wastewater Treatment Plants available on its website.

Evidence – I am not sure whether publishing these reports is a voluntary action or a regulated action, but there they are.

Point - As much as I would like to see continued annual reporting, I did find the reports highly technical, and probably beyond the limit for much of the community to comprehend or take an

interest in. Could we invest some effort in simplifying the information so that more people can make better sense of it?

I recognize that there were numerous public meetings – 18, I think – for the public to come and ask questions. Is the City satisfied that it reached a representative cross section of the public at these meetings? Beyond advertising in newspapers and reaching out to community associations, did the Biosolids Master Planning process involve reaching out to caring local people where they are? Did it reach out to boards or advisory boards of local schools, hospitals, places of worship, or social service agencies?

Providing timely and accessible information to help more stakeholders become informed and engaged can only be a good thing! I'd like to see more effort spent on making sure the WHOLE community is kept informed about developments at the HCTP. As time goes on, I want to see Toronto Water helping the community understand whether HCTP emissions are meeting the MOE standards – or approaching the more stringent EPA standards – and why or why not.

C. Now for my third big question. Where does pollution Prevention factor into all of this?

Point -Throughout the reports, I noticed a lot of emphasis on what FBIs can do to remove pollution from sewage sludge, but I didn't see much about keeping pollutants from getting into sewage in the first place. Maybe it is, and certainly should be an important part of the bigger Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan.

Evidence – I know that people are concerned about pollution in their community. We don't want trucks full of human waste going through our streets because of odour, potential spills, and increased truck traffic. We are concerned about harmful effects of Land application or the landfilling of Biosolids. We're also concerned about emissions from incineration. But we do need to choose from among all these unpleasant alternatives. No matter what solution we choose, we're right to be concerned.

Point - Why are we concerned? I think it's because we want to know that whatever decision we make regarding sewage sludge, we want and need it to be a safe and healthy decision. No matter what decision we make, can we PLEASE put more emphasis on what goes down the drain in the first place. I would like to see more:

A) **Education**, so that people and corporations do not put harmful substances down the drain

and I would like to see more

B) **Enforcement**. We require companies to have pollution prevention plans. We have laws to penalize individual polluters. Have these been effective at reducing pollution at the source?

We need strong plans to manage what gets put **into** the drains so we don't have to invest so heavily in cleaning up what we find at the treatment plants.

Thank you.