

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: A letter of support for Howard Shore's Motion re: the Former Sabiston Landfill

From: Kathy Dahlback

Sent: June 19, 2012 9:16 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; info@germanmills.org; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin

Subject: A letter of support for Howard Shore's Motion re: the Former Sabiston Landfill

Hello Councillor Shore,

I reside close to the greenspace that used to be called the Sabiston Landfill and I applaud the Notice of Motion that you intend to introduce at the meeting on Wed., June 26th. The Motion includes a move to cancel the Town of Markham hosting an Aerobic Bioreactor Landfill Technology pilot project.

I have attended several public meetings regarding this pilot project and after listening to reports by experts and receiving detailed, objective and comprehensive information on it, I have been able to conclude that the proposed project represents an unacceptable, irresponsible health risk to my neighbourhood. I am satisfied with the present measures that the Town of Markham takes to ensure the safety of the residents with regards to monitoring methane levels. Also, the intentional destruction of a rare ecosystem will not make Markham a world leader in environmental concerns and/or issues : quite the opposite.

I hope that when you put this Motion before the Council on the 26th, the vote on it will not be deferred to a later date. I will be attending the meeting, along with all my neighbours, to show the Council that we support your recommendations. Thank you very much, in advance, for striving to benefit our community.

Warmest Regards,

*Kathy Dahlback
Thornhill*

2

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Former Sabiston Landfill - next steps

From:

Sent: June 19, 2012 10:13 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public; Colangelo, Laura

Cc:

Subject: Fw: Former Sabiston Landfill - next steps

Thank you, Mr Shore, for keeping us updated on this proposal.

As my house is adjacent to the Settlers Park Meadow area, I am opposed to the Bioreactor Proposal for 3 reasons:

1 - The fact that the Aerobic Bioreactor technology is untested, and should not be tried out next to a residential area.

2 - The Sabiston Landfill site has been closed and inactive for about 30 years, is stable, and is exhibiting no problems.

No actions should be taken that would puncture the Landfill site and risk having the contents being leaked into

the adjacent river. We have seen how costly the Clean-up of such cases would become.

3 - The vehicle traffic that would be entering and leaving the Bioreactor site would be to the detriment of the natural

nature of the Settlers Park and ravine area, which has become a naturalized area, except for the erroneous 'mowing'

which was done by the Town crews earlier this month. The traffic would also be detrimental to the peace and enjoyment of their properties by people living adjacent to the ravine area, and the use of the Park by residents

as a walking and hiking area, and by animals as a living area.

There is no need to disturb this natural area.

Douglas Mahy

June 19, 2012

3

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: We support Councillor Shore's motion 100%.

From: Seville Nova

Sent: June 19, 2012 3:53 PM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Jones, Jim; Landon,

Subject: We support Councillor Shore's motion 100%.

We reside at 171 Cottonwood court and support Councillor Shore's motion 100%.

Sevil Shirinova
Artyom Sych

(14)

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Howard Shore's Motion re. the Sabiston Aerobic project

From: Brian Chadderton

Sent: June 19, 2012 6:32 PM

To: Clerks Public

Cc:

Subject: Howard Shore's Motion re. the Sabiston Aerobic project

June 19th, 2012

TO: The Mayor and Councilors of the Town of Markham,
FROM: Brian and Donna Chadderton, 3 Framingham Drive, Thornhill
RE: Howard Shore's Motion re. the Sabiston Aerobic project

This is to indicate our support for the motion of Howard Shore regarding the Sabiston Aerobic Project. We fully agree that the pilot project should not proceed and that everything possible should be done by the township, and the city thereafter, to preserve the area as a natural park in perpetuity.

In our view, the scientific evidence has not been produced to justify the environmental and fiscal costs of this project. Trading a green space filled with wildlife for an industrial-type site for 24 years comprised of a steaming, cracking, collapsing and odourous mess with wells, pipes, noisy pumps and fans running 24/7, wires, venting and monitoring equipment and leachate pools, seems like insanity. The area is on an elevated plane that will see this noise and disruption effect the properties of residents not only in the adjacent community, but German Mills, as well, as the constant drone of the machines will be heard in all of the properties backing on the Sabiston and Settler's Park ravine (current work involving heavy equipment on the edge of the project area, for example, can clearly be heard in the back yards of homes on German Mills, Milmar, Framingham, Thurogate, and Buck's Green – sound travels naturally up the river corridor.) And scientific evidence that has been produced would seem to show that reduction of greenhouse gases will be insignificant considering that most methane production from any landfill occurs in the first 12 years after which methane emissions drop rapidly to zero and near zero readings. The most recent readings provided by the Town for this 37 year old landfill are just that, zero and near zero methane emissions. This would seem to indicate that the Town's position that this will be an exemplary environmental project to Markham's favour reputationally is flawed. How much could it prove, given that there is very little methane left to reduce?

As well, the fiscal validity of this project has also not been convincingly produced by the Town. While there are existing monitoring and maintenance costs related to on-going anaerobic systems, these same costs will be required with the proposed systems, only on a much larger scale.

We hope Markham considers these an all other details of this project and support's Howard Shore's motion to bring it to a halt.

Respectfully,

Brian and Donna Chadderton

Thornhill

5

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Support for Councilor Shore's Motion

From: kimberly seymour

Sent: June 20, 2012 11:43 PM

To: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Cc: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public; Rigby Andrews; Art Pozdniakov; Bernard Sze

Subject: Support for Councilor Shore's Motion

Dear Mayor Scarpitti and Honorable Councilors,

My name is Kimberly Seymour and I live on Pine Knoll Gate, in Thornhill, and I back onto the green space, "Settler's Park" or the former Sabistan Landfill.

We bought our home, like many others in the area, specifically due to the fact that it backs onto this ravine or green space. Actually, I pay a premium to live here as MPAC assesses our property tax as "abutting green space" with a 5% premium; which I am happy to pay. I specifically went to the Town of Markham planning department to make sure that no development was planned for this site before moving here in June 2006. The response was that nothing will be done to this area as it is not allowed, due to the fact it is a former landfill. I thought "great!" I actually lost two bidding wars on this street before bidding on our current home. We specifically sought out this street and patiently waited for two years to buy here. I love the tranquility of my backyard and it is hard to believe, when I am there, I am so close to the city.

I am really tired of hearing about aerobic bioreactors. Two months after we moved into my home, these words have been haunting us. We were called to a Town meeting and felt completely defeated as we had been told two months prior that nothing would be done to this land. This aerobic technology has been discussed for over six years now; we have heard all the information, been to many meetings, received numerous emails, examined the information, and the technology is the same as it was six years ago. This proposal has consistently been rejected by the public and **no new information will change our minds to support this project**. I support Councilor Howard Shore's motion to reject the aerobic bioreactor and to bring this land into the park system to preserve and protect this fragile, rare and special green space. We do not need or want more public meetings, we do not want this motion referred or deferred, we do not want to be forced into a project the public rejects, we do not want to lose more sleep and we definitely do not want to stare into an industrial site while in our backyards.

I love the lifestyle this green space affords me. I walk on a regular basis in the park all year round; in the winter I snowshoe. It is simply beautiful; I see all kinds of animals on a regular basis including deer, coyotes, many birds and other wildlife. I see many people biking, running, birding, dog walking, cross-country skiing and enjoying this stress free area. This is a rare unique place that the residents and park users love. People travel from all over the GTA to use this park. Installing the aerobic bioreactor would immediately decrease quality of life here. The trail would be fenced off and we would not be able to walk "the circuit". As well we would have to look out to construction, an industrial site which is an eye sore and the stigma of landfill will be brought back to this neighbourhood. If this is forced through, I feel we would have to move. This would go directly against the quality of life I have chosen to live. I want to back onto a tranquil park not a bioreactor site, as I am sure you could appreciate; you would not want to back onto this either.

Residents value their quality of life here and have the right to. As Toronto and York region continues to be developed it is important to save and protect green space, especially this rare place where threatened species of birds, butterflies and turtles live. Also, there is a huge mental benefit to being close with nature. Residents do

not want their lives disrupted, and their home values to decline. Therefore it is very important to reject this proposal and to relieve the fears and anxieties of the community. This meadow needs protected not destroyed.

The Town is doing a great job with their current monitoring system and has kept us safe for over 37 years, and they should continue to do so. I have complete faith in the work they are doing and do not worry about safety. I signed up for a methane detector to be installed six years ago in my home but was never contacted by the Town. I have signed up again this time, not because I am worried about my safety but to cooperate and work with the Town and help alleviate any fears of the Town and the Ministry of Environment. The Town has complied with the Ministry of Environment standards in monitoring this site for many years. Hopefully there will be a day, in the not too distant future, when monitoring will no longer be necessary, as there have been consistently zero or new zero readings. I believe succession has already occurred on this site and nature is reclaiming the land. Many trees are growing which indicates to me the area is already aerobic.

I have lived in Markham for over 20 years and have been proud to call this place home. I have been impressed with the environmental initiatives the Town has partaken. For the town to once again show environmental leadership, this park must be protected, residents rights need to be protected and spending must be controlled. Residents are quite happy to act as ambassadors for the park and are looking forward to working with Markham to highlight such an amazing natural area. The environmental, social and fiscal costs are too great to allow such a project to be considered any further. Please support Councilor Shore's motion to protect this park and create a legacy for Markham for future generations.

Sincerely,

Kimberly

Kimberly Seymour

Settler's Park Residents Association

P.S. Thank you to the councilors who are able to join us for a tour of the park this Friday, I look forward to meeting you.

(5)

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Walk in German Mills Settler's Park

From: kimberly seymour

Sent: June 19, 2012 7:11 PM

To: Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin

Cc: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public; Burke, Valerie; Heath, Jack; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Walk in German Mills Settler's Park

Good evening Honourable councillors,

I am wondering if you may be interested in going for a short tour of "Settler's Park", the former Sabiston Landfill site, in Thornhill.

Settler's Park Residents Association is in full support of Howard Shore's motion to bring this land into the Markham park system and designate this area as natural habitat. Since we are hoping voting will occur at the next council meeting on Tuesday June 26, 2012, I feel it important for councillors not familiar with the park, to see this unique area, first hand. This is a beautiful meadow with an abundance of flora and fauna, and includes the German Mills creek to the west. I would be happy to show you this amazing area. Mr. Shore, gave Councillor Kanapathi and his son, a tour of the park this past Saturday, accompanied by Art, the president of S.P.R.A. and myself. Logan thought the park was wonderful and stated how lucky we were to have such a gift in this area. This gave me the idea to invite other councillors to see this tranquil place. I know a number of councillors such as Valerie Burke and Jack Heath are already very familiar with this green space, but for those who are not, myself or another member from S.P.R.A. can arrange to show you this area before Tuesday.

I would like to suggest, Friday afternoon anytime after 3p.m., or anytime Saturday or Sunday.

Please let me know if you would like a short (15-20 minutes) guided tour of the site or if you would like a tour outside of the suggested time.

Thank you,

Kimberly

Kimberly Seymour

Treasurer, Settler's Park Residents Association


Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Support for Councillor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow

From: Gillian Lavery

Sent: June 19, 2012 8:25 PM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Support for Councillor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow

Dear Councillor Shore,

I am writing to strongly support the motion to declare the Aerobic Bioreactor Landfill Technology pilot project no longer under consideration by the Town of Markham and bring this greenspace into the Markham park system to designate it as the "German Mills Meadow and Natural Habitat."

As someone who regularly walks through the beautiful park, preserving it in its current state is incredibly important. The debates about installing an aerobic system have gone on for many years, with much opposition from the community. As a vocal and united community, we wish to continue with the current anaerobic technology, and are satisfied with the way the Town is currently ensuring residents' safety. If additional monitoring is required, I believe residents would certainly agree to this measure, as opposed to the radical change that a new system would bring.

From the time I was 12 years old until last year, I lived with the greenspace right behind my backyard and it provided a special and unique place to walk, learn and grow. Although I moved out of my parents' home to get married, my husband and I still walk in the park and appreciate it for its unique beauty in a built-up urban area. My parents still live in their house on Cottonwood and it is a special treat for me to sit in the backyard and watch the wildlife. This park is a gift to the residents of Markham and must be preserved. The park is home to many species of animals, including two rare species of birds. We ask for your continued support to protect the greenspace, and have it added to the Markham Park System

I believe that this issue needs to be addressed on June 26 and should not be deferred until a later date. The community has attended many public meetings and heard information from community activists, scientific experts, and the Town of Markham representatives, and the information has been sufficient to come to a decision.

I support Councillor Shore's motion 100 per cent and oppose the aerobic system proposal.

Please do the right thing and vote no to the aerobic system, which would destroy the park in a way that would be irreparable.

Sincerely,

Gillian Minsky

7

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Walk in German Mills Settler's Park

From: D.Slotnick

Sent: June 19, 2012 8:37 PM

To: kimberly seymour; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin

Cc: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public; Burke, Valerie; Heath, Jack; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Re: Walk in German Mills Settler's Park

Hi Kimberly,

Friday afternoon or Saturday works for me, look forward to seeing the Park up close. Look forward to hearing the motion in Council on Tuesday, I would encourage Markham Council we must **SAVE OUR GREEN SPACE**.

Regards,

David Slotnick-President

W.N.E.N.A.

----- Original Message -----

From: kimberly seymour

To: joeli@markham.ca ; achiu@markham.ca ; alan.ho@markham.ca ; jjones@markham.ca ; glandon@markham.ca ; dhamilton@markham.ca ; cmoretti@markham.ca ; ccampbell@markham.ca

Cc: Howard Shore ; clerks@markham.ca ; vburke@markham.ca ; jheath@markham.ca ; lkanapathi@markham.ca

Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 7:10 PM

Subject: Walk in German Mills Settler's Park

Good evening Honourable councillors,

I am wondering if you may be interested in going for a short tour of "Settler's Park", the former Sabiston Landfill site, in Thornhill.

Settler's Park Residents Association is in full support of Howard Shore's motion to bring this land into the Markham park system and designate this area as natural habitat. Since we are hoping voting will occur at the next council meeting on Tuesday June 26, 2012, I feel it important for councillors not familiar with the park, to see this unique area, first hand. This is a beautiful meadow with an abundance of flora and fauna, and includes the German Mills creek to the west. I would be happy to show you this amazing area. Mr. Shore, gave Councillor Kanapathi and his son, a tour of the park this past Saturday, accompanied by Art, the president of S.P.R.A. and myself. Logan thought the park was wonderful and stated how lucky we were to have such a gift in this area. This gave me the idea to invite other councillors to see this tranquil place. I know a number of councillors such as Valerie Burke and Jack Heath are already very familiar with this green space, but for those who are not, myself or another member from S.P.R.A. can arrange to show you this area before Tuesday.

I would like to suggest, Friday afternoon anytime after 3p.m., or anytime Saturday or Sunday.

Please let me know if you would like a short (15-20 minutes) guided tour of the site or if you would like a tour outside of the suggested time.

Thank you,

Kimberly



Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

From: Bernard Sze

Sent: June 20, 2012 12:09 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

Dear Councillor Shore,

I am writing today to support your motion on Settlers' Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (the Former Sabiston Landfill). The aerobic bioreactor project was first proposed in 2006 and it was overwhelmingly rejected by the area residents then. This proposal is raised again in March of this year, however, there was nothing new presented in both the Town meeting in March and the information from the Town since. We rejected this proposal 6 years ago and we are rejecting this proposal now.

I respectfully submit that:

1. We don't need any more public meeting and we don't have any more questions to the Markham Staff and Engineering Department. This aerobic proposal has been debated for 6 years and the residents have already received all pertinent information by way of Town Meetings, Town staff, existing "aerobic" site visit, community activists and independent experts. All this information has enabled us to make an informed decision.
2. We reject this aerobic bioreactor proposal.
3. We support your motion to stop the aerobic proposal once and for all and to protect this precious and unique meadow and natural habitat by incorporating it into Markham Park system.
4. We wish to continue with the current methane monitoring and purging system. We are satisfied with the current measure to ensure the residents' safety.
5. We support additional methane monitoring measures, if warranted, to ensure residents' safety.
6. Last but not least, we do not want this motion to be deferred to a later date; we do not want this motion to be referred to staff or committee. We want Council to make a decision on June 26. Six years is long enough and we do not need any more unnecessary anxiety over the summer.

We thank you, Councillor Shore, for introducing this motion and for working tirelessly for the residents.

Bernard Sze

19.06.2012

19

To all Council Members, Town of Markham

Re. Sabiston Aerobic Pilot Project, Threatened Species and Councillor Shore's Motion

Dear Council Member,

This is to inform you that as residents of German Mills for 39 years, we oppose the Aerobic Pilot Project proposed by the Town of Markham for the former Sabiston Landfill in the valleylands of German Mills Creek. We wish to voice our concerns for a rare and treasured habitat and the threatened species it supports and to express our support for Councillor Shore's motion to come before Council June 26, 2012.

The Town's aerobic proposal was rejected by residents, from both communities on both sides of German Mills Settlers' Park, six years ago in 2006 after several meetings, much fact-finding and fieldtrips to landfill sites. The visit to the Donlands aerobic landfill in 2006 with former Councillor Erin Shapero is still remembered for the foul odour and leachate pool covered with slime and foam.

This second attempt by the Town to proceed with the aerobic plan was approved by Council contingent on community consensus in favour of the plan, as it was six years ago. There was no favourable community consensus at the meeting in March and so a second meeting was ordered which was abruptly cancelled in May just after the Settlers' Park Residents' Association was formed specifically to oppose the aerobic proposal. Community consensus has since built into almost total opposition to the aerobic plan. Most residents do not even support a second meeting, considering it unnecessary and redundant in the face of overwhelming resident opposition. Moreover, residents do not want to embarrass the people from Seneca or the consultant Mr. Beatty further by their being forced to listen to many speakers rejecting their proposal once again, when instead residents can tell Council how they feel and staff can inform all partners privately. That is a much nicer way of finalizing the matter.

Since the landfill closed 37 years ago, a meadow has developed on top of the clay cap. The climatic climax vegetation in this part of Canada is normally forest. However, since tree roots penetrate landfill here instead of rock material, forest cannot grow. Instead a meadow of lush green grasses with shallower roots thrives on the thin cap of clay covering the landfill. This is a rarity in the GTA where only 2 other such meadows exist. This natural meadow of longer grasses on the western side of the valley, enriches the ecological diversity of the valleylands, which already has mixed forest and mowed meadow habitats on the east valleyside as well as the aquatic habitat of German Mills Creek. Representative of this ecological diversity is the fact that more than 75 species of birds inhabit the valleylands.

This area has not looked like a landfill for decades. Instead, residents have been able to enjoy a precious green space, a meadow of mixed tall and short grasses with large swaths of colourful, nectar-rich wildflowers supporting many species of butterflies, and widely scattered bushes and saplings, together with an abundance of wildlife. White-Tailed Deer roam the area as do Coyotes, Red Foxes and the Eastern Cottontail Rabbit. The area is widely used by residents of Thornhill and North York for hiking, nature walks, bird watching, deer spotting and dog-walking. It has in fact become a natural park.

Ten species of birds depend on the meadow including birds of prey such as the Red-Tailed Hawk, the American Kestrel and the Great Horned Owl which use the meadow for hunting rodents and rabbits while ground-nesting birds use the meadow to nest, for cover and for insect food. Many colourful birds such as the bluebird pass through the meadow in spring and fall on their migratory routes to the north and south. Two of the ground-nesting species found here, the Bobolink and the Eastern Meadowlark have been placed on the threatened species list due to declining numbers. These birds, their nests and eggs are protected federally under the Migratory Birds Convention Act 1994, provincially by the Endangered Species Act 2007 and the Species At Risk In Ontario List regulation and by York Region which states in its Official Plan that key natural heritage features include the habitat of endangered and threatened species and are to be protected. This statement applies specifically to the meadow habitat. The Regional Official Plan goes on to state that endangered and threatened species are to be protected to ensure that biological diversity is not diminished and that site alteration and development is prohibited within the habitat of endangered and threatened species. There are also two Special Concern species in the valleylands, the Monarch butterfly on the long grass meadow and the Snapping Turtle in the Creek.

Part of this grass meadow and the very area most frequented by the Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark which are all supposed to be protected and where site alteration is prohibited is where the site of the aerobic pilot project is proposed for four years and the whole meadow is where the pilot project will be extended to, if successful, for approximately 20 years. The Town of Markham appears to be the only level of government unaware of these threatened species and the protections in place for them at the regional, provincial and federal levels. In the middle of the bird-breeding season, in 2011 and again in 2012, town workers destroyed the meadow, the birds' nests and eggs, the nestlings and fledglings by covering with clean fill (2011) and then by extensive mowing (2012). We are told by the Toronto Field Naturalists that the Bobolink population fell sharply as a result of what happened in 2011. We can only assume the same effect as a result of the 2012 mowing. The Bobolink flies almost 20 000 Km round trip from this meadow to its wintering grounds in South America and back to breed and reproduce on this meadow. With an average life span of only 5 years and breeding starting after the first year, to have 2 of those 4 breeding years wiped out consecutively due to lack of municipal oversight is a setback

from which numbers will struggle to recover. To be fair the Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark are newly designated, in early 2010 and early 2011 respectively. Nonetheless it is clear that greater care and protection of the meadow habitat and the wildlife dependent on it by the Town in the future will be crucial to make sure no more costly mistakes occur. In view of these changed circumstances, and in light of the need to comply with federal and provincial legislation and regional policy it is difficult to see how a municipality which prides itself on environmental leadership can continue to promote aerobic technology on this site.

The Greenprint, Markham's Sustainability Plan, states that the environment is one of the three pillars of sustainability, that "we value and restore the natural environment and protect biodiversity, natural capital and ecosystem services.", that "habitat loss is a risk associated with an unsustainable society", that the objectives of ecosystem integrity include increasing biodiversity and developing and supporting wildlife habitat. Recommendation # 217 states, "Protect and enhance existing wildlife habitat and provide green spaces that are biodiverse." Residents couldn't agree more, we applaud these goals.

Residents do not want to live with an industrial-type site instead of green space filled with wildlife, not for 4 years and certainly not for 24 years. Who in their right mind would wish for 24 years of a steaming, cracking, collapsing and odorous mess with wells, pipes, pumps, fans, wires, venting and monitoring equipment, leachate pools, fences, machines pushing clean fill, vehicles with town workers, consultants, Seneca students and others coming and going, behind their homes? How much enjoyment is anyone going to get out of that?

Residents are not convinced that reduction of greenhouse gases will be significant considering that most methane production from any landfill occurs in the first 12 years after which methane emissions drop rapidly to zero and near zero readings. The most recent readings provided by the Town for this 37 year old landfill are just that, zero and near zero methane emissions. We are told that emissions can spike and build up in confined spaces and possibly explode but that is also true of aerobic technology where spontaneous combustion, fires and explosions can also occur. Residents of this area have lives to live and property values to maintain just like everyone else. If one has to sell one's home, how difficult will it be and how badly will property values be affected with an industrial-type site just beyond the back fence?

The Town has kept residents safe for 30 years with anaerobic landfill technology and methane collection and residents wish this minimally intrusive approach to continue with minimal disturbance to residents and minimal disturbance to the ecosystem of the valleylands of German Mills Creek. If after 37 years the Town is still overly worried about resident safety we hope Councillor Shore's motion will provide the necessary reassurances.

We oppose the aerobic pilot project and support Councillor Shore's motion, and we ask for your support to save this unique greenspace and bring it into the Markham park system. If the second meeting had not been cancelled, this nightmare would already be over. Now, only Council can bring this extended nightmare residents are being forced to live through to an end before the summer recess. We ask you to vote in favour of the motion. We don't want this motion referred to staff or deferred until September, we want it dealt with by Council on June 26, 2012.

Residents would like to work with the Town to establish as soon as possible a level of protection for the meadow which would, for example, set out the best times of the year for mowing and adding fill, the extent of such activities and how best to inform and remind town workers and work schedulers that there are special protections in place for this rare habitat. We would also like to work with the Town to make good some of the damage done to the meadow, providing bird perches to replace the saplings mowed down for example and to work towards the recovery and enhancement of the ecological diversity of these valleylands so the area becomes a showpiece of how something so precious can result from something so ugly with a little TLC. This is the kind of environmental leadership and stewardship we want the Town to be recognized for and this is a far less expensive option for the Town and its residents than spending half a million dollars on an aerobic pilot project, a cost multiplied many times more than that when extended to the whole area for a much longer period of time.

Sincerely,

Eileen and Steve Liasi

10
Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: request to vote Howard Shore's Motion re: the Former Sabiston Landfill on June 26 Council Meeting - please do not defer this

-----Original Message-----

From: kyibahor
Sent: June 20, 2012 2:31 AM
To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public
Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan
Subject: request to vote Howard Shore's Motion re: the Former Sabiston Landfill on June 26 Council Meeting - please do not defer this

Hi Mr. Shore,

I live on Cottonwood Crt and your Motion has a great importance to me! I was following this issue very closely and always tried to have an unbiased view on the Town's proposal.

I wish to thank the Town for detailed and comprehensive information it was providing us about methane readings and advantages of aerobic technology. Starting from 2004, it tried so hard! It held several very informative public meetings with impressive presenters (Mr. Beatty, the major aerobic subcontractor was so persistent all these years and gave us many interesting facts - I was shocked to learn e.g. that "methane gas is the one of the most toxic gases of all the greenhouse gases" but then I was relieved when referred to the chemistry textbook and confirmed my suspicion that methane is just "a colorless, non-toxic/nonpoisonous, flammable gas created by anaerobic decomposition of organic compounds", we were also alarmed by the warnings that because of methane our houses can blow up any minute, but when, again thanks to the Town, we saw the reports of methane readings from 2010-2012 showing zero or near-zero results for all the probes abutting the homes, we realized that we are in good and reliable hands of professional staff and should not worry about our safety). Starting from 2004, the Town prepared several Staff reports, where it stated that "gas burning system installed in the fan house has not been working for the past few years due to the lack of gases that can be collected for burning." "The results showed no measurable leachate impacts in German Mills Creek due to the landfill; the water quality meets MOE Surface Water requirements." " No instances of methane above MOE standards at boundary gas probes".

Obviously, for more than 6 years, a very extensive research was conducted (e.g. in 2006 Beatty & Associates was recommended to be retained to carry out the final design, preparation of tender document, site supervision and contract administration for the Installation of Aerobic Landfill and Leachate Recirculation System at the Settler's Park Landfill site at an upset limit of \$108,000 (excluding GST). I think we all agree that for these six years Town Engineering , Finance and Administration Staff had more than enough time and resources to provide public with exhaustive and comprehensive PROPER information, which it did with excellence. And we appreciate this!

On the other hand, I am also very grateful to independent experts and wildlife protection activists, including TFN, for their informational input and sharing alternative from the Town engineering department view on this proposal. I spent a lot of my time researching solid waste management literature, environmental aspects, advantages and disadvantages of dry tomb (conventional), aerobic, anaerobic and hybrid technologies. Based on these studies, and based on analysis of material from numerous boreholes provided by the Town I may conduct that I don't expect catastrophic heat and strong LFG (landfill gases) emission to be an issue with proposed aerobic scheme. (On October 4, 2006 at the Public Information Meeting, the Town presented that "Numerous boreholes have been drilled in and around the landfill, to examine the waste material, methane levels and contaminants in the groundwater. The drilling encountered typical dry household waste (e.g. newspapers, kitchen waste, etc.), building rubble (e.g. wood, concrete, brick etc.) and various types of earth fill (e.g. topsoil, sand, clay, etc.)". This means that this former landfill even in 2006 already did not have any significant organic waste, which is the major component and requirement to have aerobic process working. The fact that no organic waste was found in boreholes, means that no methane-generating substance is present as well, and the whole idea of aerobic proposal is a mug's game lacking both those infernal threats that can be found in the reports about aerobic technology (Increased gas emissions, Increased odors, physical instability of waste mass due to increased moisture and density, instability of liner systems, surface seeps and landfill fires and spontaneous combustions) and at the same time lacking any environmental or economic sense as well.

As a result, we have a proposal to spend \$553,000 ADDITIONALLY and in parallel to existing annual methane monitoring expenses on some experimental aerobic technology without having conditions necessary for aerobic treatment, on the technology to research the subject which actually does not exist in this former landfill. Any graph showing methane emission in the landfill will demonstrate that after the first 20 years methane emission drops significantly and becomes marginal after 30-40 years. Sabiston landfill was closed over 37 years ago and the probes reading demonstrate that there is absolutely no sense to introduce this experiment here.

Based on all said, I request you, Honorable Councillors, to stop this 6-year maneuvering around treatment of what does not need treatment, bring piece and confidence to the community and finally vote for and support this motion and close this painful "landfill stigma" once and forever. Not only all residents of our community will be grateful to you for this wise and spirited decision, but also 70 species of birds, including threatened ones, 15 species of mammals, and all creatures living in our beautiful meadow will say thanks to you!

Sincerely,

Irene Pozdniakova
Thornhill

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Subject: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

From: A Sze

Sent: June 20, 2012 4:13 AM

To: hshore@markham.ca, clerks@markham.ca

Cc: fscarpitti@markham.ca, jheath@markham.ca, vburke@markham.ca, joeli@markham.ca, achiu@markham.ca, alan.ho@markham.ca, info@germanmills.org, jjones@markham.ca, glandon@markham.ca, dhamilton@markham.ca, cmoretti@markham.ca, ccampbell@markham.ca, lkanapathi@markham.ca

Subject: Subject: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

Dear Councillor Shore,

I am writing today to support your motion on Settlers' Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (the Former Sabiston Landfill). The aerobic bioreactor project was first proposed in 2006 and it was overwhelmingly rejected by the area residents then. This proposal is raised again in March of this year, however, there was nothing new presented in both the Town meeting in March and the information from the Town since. We rejected this proposal 6 years ago and we are rejecting this proposal now.

I respectfully submit that:

1. We don't need any more public meeting and we don't have any more questions to the Markham Staff and Engineering Department. This aerobic proposal has been debated for 6 years and the residents have already received all pertinent information by way of Town Meetings, Town staff, existing "aerobic" site visit, community activists and independent experts. All this information has enabled us to make an informed decision.
2. We reject this aerobic bioreactor proposal.
3. We support your motion to stop the aerobic proposal once and for all and to protect this precious and unique meadow and natural habitat by incorporating it into Markham Park system.
4. We wish to continue with the current methane monitoring and purging system. We are satisfied with the current measure to ensure the residents' safety.
5. We support additional methane monitoring measures, if warranted, to ensure residents' safety.
6. Last but not least, we do not want this motion to be deferred to a later date; we do not want this motion to be referred to staff or committee. We want Council to make a decision on June 26. Six years is long enough and we do not need any more unnecessary anxiety over the summer.

We thank you, Councillor Shore, for introducing this motion and for working tirelessly for the residents.

Angel Sze

12

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Proposed Aerobic Landfill Project

From: Rigby Andrews

Sent: June 20, 2012 8:51 PM

To: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; info@germanmills.org; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Cc: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Subject: Proposed Aerobic Landfill Project

Dear Town of Markham Council Members

I am a resident of Pine Knoll Gate, but I do not back on to the Meadow / Green space / the Sabiston Landfill. I support the motion that was put forward by Councillor Shore on June 12th with respect to preserving the green space.

I think Markham does have an opportunity to show strong environmental leadership here by showing clear and strong leadership in preserving this area of land, which can only be described as a gift to the present generation and those that follow us long after we are gone. Where else would you find such a natural piece of meadow land in the GTA or other cities that provides the tranquility of this space. It is used by untold numbers of people on a daily basis, not just the houses that back on to the space but by the surrounding area residents. To proceed with this aerobic project in any form is, in my opinion, misguided and anything but environmentally friendly, in fact quite the opposite, not to mention a terrible waste of money. The estimated cost for the test site is approximately \$550,000. I have not seen the costs for a full scale roll-out. The Town report of October 4th 2006 states (page 20) *" the existing gas collection system will remain in place until confirmation that methane gas is eliminated"* It also states (Page 21) *"The proposed aerobic system is to allow the waste to decompose to a stable state - system will be in place until a stable state is reached (**estimated to be several decades**)"*. I believe this is a needless waste of money to monitor the aerobic system as this former landfill was closed 37 years ago. In another report is states that some areas have has already settled 4 meters. When this came up for review in 2006 the residents were opposed to it and remain opposed to this project today.

This is a beautiful piece of heritage land and should be preserved in its natural and existing state. From what I can gather this technology is effective on **current and active landfills**, one of the main benefits is the fact that the land compacts 25% - 30% which enables an existing landfill site to extend its capacity and life, thus saving costs and limiting the need to find more landfill sites; in this capacity I am not against this technology. This landfill is unique, not only was it closed 37 years ago but it is located in and close to residential areas. I don't believe that vast numbers of residents in the area are demanding that the Town do something about the Landfill. In fact quite the opposite, almost all the local residents want nothing done to the land except to preserve it in its natural and evolved state which supports vegetation and wildlife.

In my opinion there is no value in providing SENECA or the Town with an opportunity to study a technology that has already been studied elsewhere, especially to a landfill that has been closed for 37 years. We all know that this project's technology works on **active** landfills, there are many studies on this. It just doesn't make any sense to me in terms of providing a business case that is fiscally responsible or ecologically responsible to proceed with this pilot or full scale project. The impact to

this 37 year old landfill, not to mention the destruction to the green space does not justify moving forward with the aerobic project.

I support Councillor Shore's motion to preserve this piece of land that nature has gifted to the Town of Markham. This would be a very positive "green" message and would prove the Town's commitment to the environment, and something to be proud of. Markham's own Greenprint Sustainability Plan states: *"We value and restore the natural environment and protect biodiversity, natural capital, and ecosystem services"*.

I hope that when Councillor Shore's motion comes up before Council on the 26th it can be passed and not deferred to another date for more study. How much more is there to study? This is not a new issue for the neighborhood or the Town, it has been on the books since 2004, and there are no new facts to discuss and several reports have already been made on this by Town staff and Consultants. In the Town's report of Nov 22 2004 it states *"Also, trees are not able to survive on the site because there is no oxygen in the root zone below the landfill cover due to anaerobic decomposition of the waste"*. Please see the picture below. Please help us end this on-going disruption to our lives and preserve this space..

You can see from this picture, which is just one part of the area, this is not a barren waste land but an active grassland / meadow that the Town has already returned to nature.



A sample View of the Landfill in Thornhill Sabiston Landfill Settlers Park Site

Please don't force this project on the residents...Please help leave a legacy and preserve this piece of Heritage land in its natural state for this generation and the next to enjoy. Help us bring this into the Park's system.

Thank you

Rigby Andrews

6 Pine Knoll Gate

Thornhill

12

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Proposed Aerobic Landfill Project and your June 12 motion

From: Rigby Andrews
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 7:48 AM
To: 'Shore, Howard'
Cc: 'clerks@markham.ca'
Subject: Proposed Aerobic Landfill Project and your June 12 motion

Dear Councillor Shore

I am a resident of Pine Knoll Gate, but I do not back on to the Meadow / Green space / formally the Sabiston Landfill. I support the motion that was put forward by you to on June 12th with respect to preserving the green space.

I think Markham does have an opportunity to show strong environmental leadership here by showing clear and strong leadership in preserving this piece of land, which can only be described as a gift to the present generation and those that follow us long after we are gone.. Where else would you find such a natural meadow land in the GTA or other cities that provides the tranquility of this space. It is used by untold numbers of people on a daily basis. Not just the houses that back on to the space but by the surrounding area residents. To proceed with this aerobic project in any form is, in my opinion, misguided and anything but environmentally friendly, in fact quite the opposite, not to mention a terrible waste of money. This former landfill was closed 37 years ago. When this came up for review in 2006 the residence were opposed to it and we remain opposed to this project.

This is a beautiful piece of heritage land and should be preserved. In its natural state. From what I can gather this technology is effective on **current and active landfills**, one of the main benefits is the fact that the land compacts 25% - 30% which enables an existing landfill site to extend its capacity and life and thus saving costs or the need to find more landfill sites. I am not against technology. This landfill is unique, not only was it closed 37 years ago but it is located in and close to residential areas. I don't believe that vast numbers of residents of the area are demanding that the Town do something about the Landfill. In fact quite the opposite, almost all the local residents want nothing done to the land except to preserve it in its natural and evolved state. It supports vegetation and wildlife.

In my opinion there is no value in providing SENECA or the Town with an opportunity to study a technology that has already been studied elsewhere. Especially to a landfill that has been closed for 37 years. We all know that this project's technology works on **active** landfills, there are many studies on this. It just doesn't make any sense to me in terms of providing a business case that is fiscally responsible or ecologically responsible simply to study, as a pilot or full scale project the impact to this 37 year old landfill not to mention the destruction of this natural site that will occur.

I support your motion to preserve this piece of land that nature has gifted to the Town of Markham.. This would be a very positive environment friendly message and something to be proud of. I hope that when this motion comes up before Council on the 26th it can be **passed** and not referred to another date for a vote. This is not a new issue for the neighborhood, there are no new facts to discuss. Please help us end this on-going disruption to our lives.

You can see from this picture, which is just one part of the area, this is not a barren waste land but an active grassland / meadow.



A sample View of the Landfill in Thornhill Sabiston Landfill Settlers Park Site

Please don't let Council force this project on the residents...Please help leave a legacy and preserve this piece of Heritage land in its natural state for this generation and the next to enjoy. Help us bring this into the Park's system.

Thank you

Rigby Andrews

13

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: I support the motion 100%

From: Hernan

Sent: June 20, 2012 8:25 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: I support the motion 100%

Howard Shore, Thornhill-Markham Councillor Ward 2

Dear Mr. Shore:

I would like to add my support to your Motion to recognize the former "Sabiston Landfill" as a unique natural area adding this greenspace to the Markham Park System as proposed in the Motion.

I overwhelmingly reject the aerobic bioreactor experiment.

I sincerely hope that this decision will protect our greenspace and will protect this natural and wildlife habitat, I believe this is an excellent opportunity for Markham to show environmental leadership by protecting this unique area in the GTA.

I have been a proud resident of Markham for over 20 years and have really enjoyed living in Thornhill, especially the tranquility of backing onto this green space,
I would like to see this decision resolved on June 26, and not have this Motion deferred or referred to a latter time.

Respectfully,

Hernan Polak

(144)

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Support Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat

From: Florence Man

Sent: June 20, 2012 9:17 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Support Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat

Dear Councillor Shore,

I am writing to support your motion on Settlers' Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (the Former Sabiston Landfill).

The aerobic bioreactor project was first proposed in 2006 and it was overwhelmingly rejected by the area residents then.

This proposal is raised again in March of this year, however, there was nothing new presented in both the Town meeting in March and the information from the Town since. We rejected this proposal 6 years ago and we are rejecting this proposal now.

I strongly feel that:

1. We don't need any more public meeting and we don't have any more questions to the Markham Staff and Engineering Department. This aerobic proposal has been debated for 6 years and the residents have already received all pertinent information by way of Town Meetings, Town staff, existing "aerobic" site visit, community activists and independent experts. All this information has enabled us to make an informed decision.
2. We reject this aerobic bioreactor proposal.
3. We support your motion to stop the aerobic proposal once and for all and to protect this precious and unique meadow and natural habitat by incorporating it into Markham Park system.
4. We wish to continue with the current methane monitoring and purging system. We are satisfied with the current measure to ensure the residents' safety.
5. We support additional methane monitoring measures, if warranted, to ensure residents' safety.
6. Last but not least, we do not want this motion to be deferred to a later date; we do not want this motion to be referred to staff or committee. We want Council to make a decision on June 26. Six years is long enough and we do not need any more unnecessary anxiety over the summer.

Thank you, Councillor Shore, for introducing this motion and for working tirelessly for the residents.

Florence Man

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Re. In support of Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

From: Ross Lavery

Sent: June 20, 2012 9:35 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Re. In support of Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

To all who it concerns,

Having lived at 62 Cottonwood for the majority of my life, I've had the pleasure of enjoying the meadow that the house backs on to. It is for this reason that I strongly support the motion of councillor Shore to designate the space as German Mills Meadow and Natural Habitat to protect it from unnecessary, nefarious, and destructive Aerobic pilot projects that were proposed, and have *continued* to be proposed throughout my years living in the area.

The subject needs to be dropped once and for all. This needs to happen immediately on June 26th, not deferred to a hypothetical date in the future. Those in favour of this project are hoping that by that time, the focus on this issue will have subsided.

It is abundantly clear to all of the members of the community what the advantages and disadvantages of the Aerobic proposal are. The community has made their voice loud and clear for over 6 years. This is NOT something that we support, we have never supported it, and we never will support it. The attempts to drag this process on, to let the subject die down for a year or two, and then try and sneak it in again have gone on long enough.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ross Lavery

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

From: F Sze

Sent: June 20, 2012 9:49 AM

To: hshore@markham.ca, clerks@markham.ca

Cc: fscarpitti@markham.ca, jheath@markham.ca, vburke@markham.ca, joeli@markham.ca, achiu@markham.ca, alan.ho@markham.ca, info@germanmills.org, jjones@markham.ca, glandon@markham.ca, dhamilton@markham.ca, cmoretti@markham.ca, ccampbell@markham.ca, lkanapathi@markham.ca

Subject: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

Dear Councillor Shore,

I am writing today to support your motion on Settlers' Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (the Former Sabiston Landfill).

The aerobic bioreactor project was first proposed in 2006 and it was overwhelmingly rejected by the area residents then. This proposal is raised again in March of this year, however, there was nothing new presented in both the Town meeting in March and the information from the Town since. We rejected this proposal 6 years ago and we are rejecting this proposal now.

I respectfully submit that:

1. We don't need any more public meeting and we don't have any more questions to the Markham Staff and Engineering Department. This aerobic proposal has been debated for 6 years and the residents have already received all pertinent information by way of Town Meetings, Town staff, existing "aerobic" site visit, community activists and independent experts. All this information has enabled us to make an informed decision.
2. We reject this aerobic bioreactor proposal.
3. We support your motion to stop the aerobic proposal once and for all and to protect this precious and unique meadow and natural habitat by incorporating it into Markham Park system.
4. We wish to continue with the current methane monitoring and purging system. We are satisfied with the current measure to ensure the residents' safety.
5. We support additional methane monitoring measures, if warranted, to ensure residents' safety.
6. Last but not least, we do not want this motion to be deferred to a later date; we do not want this motion to be referred to staff or committee. We want Council to make a decision on June 26. Six years is long enough and we do not need any more unnecessary anxiety over the summer.

We thank you, Councillor Shore, for introducing this motion and for working tirelessly for the residents.

Frank Sze

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: In support of Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

From: Susheila Li

Sent: June 20, 2012 10:22 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: In support of Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The former Sabiston Landfill has become so much since its closure nearly four decades ago. The Green space has become a rare jewel in the city and countless bird and mammal species have made their homes within it.

It is a valuable natural environment that should be protected!

The current anaerobic technology has given us this wonderful space and given natural homes for many rare birds and mammals. We must continue with this method of monitoring to keep this area the way it is.

Council needs to make the decision to protect this green space **on JUNE 26th, 2012** and not deferred to a later date. The community has been voicing their objections throughout this entire process and it needs to be settled now to bring peace of mind to the residents of German Mills.

Please add this unique ecosystem to the Markham Park System and protect it.

Thank you for your time and support!

Susheila Li

(18)

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Subject: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

From: cs 098

Sent: June 20, 2012 11:13 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Subject: Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

Dear Councillor Shore,

I am writing today to support your motion on Settlers' Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (the Former Sabiston Landfill).

The aerobic bioreactor project was first proposed in 2006 and it was overwhelmingly rejected by the area residents then. This proposal is raised again in March of this year, however, there was nothing new presented in both the Town meeting in March and the information from the Town since. We rejected this proposal 6 years ago and we are rejecting this proposal now.

I respectfully submit that:

1. We don't need any more public meeting and we don't have any more questions to the Markham Staff and Engineering Department. This aerobic proposal has been debated for 6 years and the residents have already received all pertinent information by way of Town Meetings, Town staff, existing "aerobic" site visit, community activists and independent experts. All this information has enabled us to make an informed decision.
2. We reject this aerobic bioreactor proposal.
3. We support your motion to stop the aerobic proposal once and for all and to protect this precious and unique meadow and natural habitat by incorporating it into Markham Park system.
4. We wish to continue with the current methane monitoring and purging system. We are satisfied with the current measure to ensure the residents' safety.
5. We support additional methane monitoring measures, if warranted, to ensure residents' safety.
6. Last but not least, we do not want this motion to be deferred to a later date; we do not want this motion to be referred to staff or committee. We want Council to make a decision on June 26. Six years is long enough and we do not need any more unnecessary anxiety over the summer.

We thank you, Councillor Shore, for introducing this motion and for working tirelessly for the residents.

11 Pine Knoll Gate
Thornhill, ON

19

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Councillor Shore's Motion on Former Sasbiston Landfill
Attachments: german_mills_settlers_park_proposal_revised__2012pdf.pdf;
letter_to_town_of_markham_may_15_2012pdf.pdf; Commentary on Methane
Production.docx; Historical Probes Data-2010-2011.pdf;
Sabiston_GPS_Points_Env_Monitoring_System.jpg; TO110010 Landfill Gas Probes Jan2012
to Apr 2012.pdf

From: Artem Pozdniakov

Sent: June 20, 2012 11:45 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don;
Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Re: Councillor Shore's Motion on Former Sasbiston Landfill

Dear Councilor Shore, Mr. Mayor, Honorable Councilors,

I know that Mr. Mayor suggests deferring decision on this motion till September. I do not think the deferral option will benefit our community and Markham in general, and will only negatively affect the image of the Town and people's trust in effectiveness of their elected representative bodies. Here is my reasoning:

Public perception of the aerobic project and debates around it do not contribute to improving of Markham's image as environmental leader. On the contrary! Media honestly shows (Attachemnt 2) degree of anxiety and concerns of public about poor economic feasibility of the proposal, threat of unjustified waste of taxpayer \$\$ and detrimental effects of the proposed project on the current fragile and unique natural balance and exclusive wildlife habitat featuring 15 species of mammals such as deer and 70 species of birds including threatened meadow skylark and bobolink who only nest here and 2 other meadows in GTA. Any extension of the period when this community is kept in a state of unnecessary anxiety and negative informational background will serve no good - neither to the community nor to Markham in general.

What is very important, delay in solving this issue will only further hurt the image of Markham as environmental leader. Please try to google the keyword "Markham environmental leader". As a result on the very first page, you will see the links to information about debates over aerobic bioreactor experiment and articles about community environmental and wildlife protection concerns. Is this what we want Markham to be famous for? I don't think so!

We don't want to see the Town of Markham perceived as stubborn and opinionated individuals with agendas which are unclear to the public, as people who do not want to hear the public voice and do not care about wildlife preservation and community concerns. No, this is not the image of the Town we have in mind. We all know that until recently the name of Markham has always been associated with a true environmental leadership, which is ALWAYS based on careful consensus-based approach to such sensitive issues as natural habitat and wildlife preservation. And we believe Markham has to continue to be a true environmental leader!

Therefore, I address my sincere request to the Council – for a sake of piece in the community, for a sake of positive trusted image of Markham as an environmental leader, for a sake of innocent threatened birds, reptiles and animals who choose to live in this unique habitat, please do not delay your decision, do not defer it to September, do not refer it again to the staff – we all have already suffered enough and heard enough from the staff for the past 6 years, they had a plenty of time to collect and provide full information. Delaying

the decision and shuffling data back and forth will not change the simple truth “AEROBIC BIOERACTOR PROPOSAL LACKS COMMUNITY CONSENT” and this is confirmed by over 500 unique signatures on the petitions the people were addressing to the Town and the Council.

Artem Pozdnyakov
Settlers Park Residents Association, President

For your reference I attach some material which could help you understand importance of timely proactive decision by the Council

1. People’s comments on the aerobic proposal
2. Media and Other Informational Coverage
3. TFN reports
4. Gas monitoring readings statistics
5. Petitions

Attachment #1

People’s comments on the aerobic proposal (uncensored and reflecting solely opinions of the individuals who wrote the comments)
<http://germanmills.org/markham-communities-concerned-about-markham-council-aerobic-proposal-threat-to-health-and-nature/>

Comments on June 5: German Mills Settlers Park is an unique animal and bird sanctuary, the proposed plans might put at risk wild life and destroy unique ecological system.

Comments on June 1: Please don’t do it!

Comments on May 31: This is a technically risky project, projecting the results from a small test area to a much larger (more than 12 times) area, without knowing the composition (heterogeneity) of the waste. This aerobic technology will require injection of large quantities of water. Since movement of water in the subsurface cannot be predicted, collection and recycle of all the leachate will not be possible. As a result, more contaminated water will be produced. Any methane reduction will result in increased carbon dioxide production, which will be released into air and water. If the aerobic system is implemented, two systems (the existing monitoring system and the aerobic system) will require maintenance for probably several decades. From the environmental, technical and economic points of view the proposed aerobic system cannot be justified. This project may put Markham on the map, not as a champion of the environment but as the destroyer of an existing unique ecosystem, for the perceived benefit of methane reduction, if indeed this is the motivation.

Comments on May 30: I first walked through the park with my neighbour when I was about five years old. For years, it was a piece of another world that didn’t seem to belong in our suburban area. Now, it serves as a reminder that even in the worst of conditions, like an abandoned landfill, nature will win-out. Destroying this place, would be to let something truly good die in the name of industry and science. I personally love science; I love how it can make the world a better place, but I think too often, science is used for all the wrong

reasons. People never seem to realize that it shouldn't be about what you can do, but what you should do. And I guess the ending question is: Should you destroy a natural habitat for money? Should you lower house values for hundreds so that the municipality can have a little extra cash? Should you endanger those same people with possible leaked toxins? You can do all of the above, but should you? And as for the rest of us, we can fight for our beloved ravine, but should we? Clearly, I think we should fight.

Comments on May 29: Leave German Mills Settlers Park alone!! Go focus the time and money into a better project for the Town of Markham

Comments on May 28: why is this being discussed again? We are NOT interested.

Comments on May 28: I am concerned with this proposal just 125 m. from residential homes. Aerobic treatment of the landfill closed 37 years ago does not make environmental and economic sense. Methane monitor system probes abutting residential area show zero/near zero readings. Carrying out this expensive experiment (\$530,000 for just first 3 years) in parallel with existing monitoring system will mean waste of ratepayers' money, aimless destruction of unique natural wildlife habitat, disturbance of residential community, decreased value of the community property, reduced tax base, potential environmental/health concerns (moisture, temperature, noise and odour pollution). Proposal was turned down by the community in 2006 and now, even more people ask to stop this plan that lacks public involvement and does not address community concerns about wildlife preservation and effective budgeting policy. I request to ABANDON this plan as well as any efforts to continue with this experiment amidst the residential area.

Comments on May 28: We told you we didn't want it in 2006 and nothing has changed. The risks are still the same. Please listen again. The answer is categorically and emphatically NO!

Comments on May 26: Town of Markham should respect public vote against the proposal

Over 200 people signed the petitions asking to stop the proposal. To do aerobic bioreactor experiment on a site, which was closed 37 years ago, with a reliable (thanks to the Town of Markham!) methane control and monitoring system and zero or near-zero methane readings means waste of tax-payers money and leads to aimless destruction of unique natural wildlife habitat and disturbance of peaceful residential community, painful resurgence of "landfill stigma", decreased value of the community property and thus reduced tax base and could potentially lead to many environmental and health concerns, including excessive moisture, temperature, air contamination, noise and odour pollution.

Comments on May 26: German Mills Settlers Park is a Nature's gift to Birds, Animals and Residents

Not only I agree with "herpol" 100% but like to add that this park is a Nature's gift to many species of beautiful birds, animals (rabbits, deer and more) and fish in water in the creek. Many residents have hung bird feeders to invite birds to this beautiful park. This community Ward Councillor and the Mayor have NO appreciation of this park and want to ruin this Nature's gift.

Comments on May 26: Help save German Mills Settlers Park

This park is doing fine without the intervention of the town of Markham, there is practically no methane emissions, new trees are growing, mother nature is doing a better job than any of the "experiments" that the city is proposing (and without exorbitant amounts of taxpayers monies). I wanted to add my voice to an increasing number of neighbours that oppose this project and enjoy the tranquility of the park.

Comments on May 25: resources on aerobic technology and the proposal to use it in German Mills Park

Thanks for making this public! We need open unbiased discussion with full disclosure of details of financial, environmental, safety, quality-of-life and health impact. People need answers to disturbing questions on possible consequences and real long-term plans of the town. Related links below – let people read information from all debating parties to make a balanced objective opinion. Markham.ca – Public notice of the March 19 Meeting and brief info on the proposed pilot project Germanmills.org – Daily updated blog with information about aerobic technology, people's concerns and opinions posts, petition and email to the project initiators. SaveSettlersPark.wordpress.com – An initiative of concerned residents. Petition, Issue description, simple facts, TFN papers, etc. gmra.ca/issues/aerobictest – Resources about aerobic test site. Text of Public Meeting held on March 19. bioreactor.org – Comprehensive information about various technologies used in landfill bioreactors, including aerobic, anaerobic and hybrid. bbeatty.com – project subcontractor website

Comments on May 25: This complacent power hungry group at the Town of Markham should be voted out for riding roughshod over their constituents with mind boggling expensive environmentally questionable projects.

Comments on May 25: Pls leave German Mills park alone. It is a beautiful an natural environement area for animals. Instead of spending the money where residents don't want, spend the money fixing the roas that was destroyed 2 summers ago which has become a breeding ground for mosquitos and get rid of the LOUD noise of the pump. We would have NOT bought our house if these plans had been in the works. I hope that you listen to the residents concerns and that these concerns are heard. Thank you.

Comments on May 25: Pls leave German Mills park alone. It is a beautiful an natural environement area for animals. Instead of spending the money where residents don't want, spend the money fixing the roas that was destroyed 2 summers ago which has become a breeding ground for mosquitos and get rid of the LOUD noise of the pump. We would have NOT bought our house if these plans had been in the works. I hope that you listen to the residents concerns and that these concerns are heard. Thank you.

Comments on May 25: Really????? You can rest assured that if this goes through, this entire panel will have lost my vote, confidence, and respect, in people I originally believed had the best interests of its constituents at heart. I see that I was mistaken.

Comments on May 25: Any experimental technology should be tested far from residentoal area and should not disturb the nature.

Comments on May 25: This park means clean air, health and joy for the people and home for wildlife. Do not touch this without a good reason.

Comments on May 25: People travel here to bird watch. There has been several tree planting initiatives in this park. We did these to benefit our enviroment and now this is threatening to destory it. Put a stop to this idea immediately!

Comments on May 25: Please leave good enough alone.... I like the park, I walk in the park, (I relax in the park) It is my sanctuary. I hope you get my point.

Comments on May 25: The residents of this community deserve to be protected from any health risks that come from this project. My family uses this park frequently as do many other people in the community and it should be protected.

Comments on May 25: The health and environmental risks far outweigh any potential benefits. This is a lovely park and it is a treasure to this community.

Comments on May 24: German Mills is a beautiful nature park, as well as a historic park. It is a great oxygen-maker, a peaceful park for kids, adults and seniors, also a memorial to Markham city, even Toronto. How could some people plan to destroy it by the criminal and irresponsible testing. We should apply to make it (together with Berczy park) to be a provincial park to protect all existing. In this case, the land will be better planned and managed by both province government and Markham city, will have stronger support and better development.

Comments on May 20: Dear Sirs, in 2010 I used to live in a house the backyard of which faces German Mills. I was astonished by Park's wild nature. It would be a pity to see it disturbed.

Comments on May 20: The German Mills is a settlement with schools, homes, parks. This project will effect the livelihoods of so many surrounding the parks. I completely resist any such action by Town of Markham.

Comments on May 20: Dear Sirs, in 2010 I used to live in a house the backyard of which faces German Mills. I was astonished by Park's wild nature. It would be a pity to see it disturbed. Thank you

Comments on May 19: This important greenspace is home to countless birds and wildlife and should be left alone. Not to mention, a residential area is not appropriate for this type of experiment, when the impact on the neighbouring residences and wildlife is not understood. Conduct your experiment somewhere else.

Comments on May 19: Leave the Park alone.

Comments on May 18: Communities around German Mills Park, Park visitors, and wildlife nature activists call for protection of this place from a bio experiment in a residential area with a unique park and natural habitat. Two independent community sites were created with blogs and articles about people's concerns – germanmills.org and save-settlers-park.wordpress.com. Two petitions are collecting signatures now. One petition collected 42 signatures just in 4 days – <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/stop-bioreactor-sabiston-landfill-project-thornhill/> Another has already 120 signatures since April 30 – <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/save-german-mills-settlers-park/>. Isn't this enough for the Town of Markham to realize that this proposal is not supported by the community?

Comments on May 18: Visiting German Mills Park yesterday for the first time, I was surprised by its wild nature. I never thought it can be so beautiful right in the heart of the city. It's indeed one of the most astonishing parks in the GTA. We should take care of it – not play with it. Please don't destroy this beautiful place. Save it for our children!

Comments on May 18: The proposed aerobic "experiment" will be a health hazard to every resident in our community.

Comments on May 18: The proposed experiment represents an unacceptable, irresponsible health risk. The status quo does not. The intentional destruction of a rare ecosystem will not make Markham a world leader

in environmental concerns and/or issues : quite the opposite.

Comments on May 17: Please stop destruction of green space and invironment around our area!

Comments on May 17: Hi, We are a young couple (in our late 20s) just purchased our home – at Cottonwood court and we so thrilled that we were backing German mills. We put all our hardwork, effort and everything we have into this to purchase this home. We have so much of dreams and goals, and are planning our future and our kids future with the schools and the environment that we are surrounded by... If we prefered pollution or noise etc. we would have chosen a different neighbourhood. There's a reason for so many people to reside around German Mills. Please help us and save our community and dont let our dreams be shattered. Thank you.

Comments on May 17: Markham is clearly trying to capitalize on what is now unusable land at the expense of its current residence. Would the people making the decisions be willing to live this close to this experiment? I would think not. Shame on you!

Comments on May 17: This beautiful park gives life and joy to all surrounding neighborhood and community. Please continue to help preserve this rare green space for our community.

Comment on May 16: This experiment has to be conducted in a non-residential area !!

Comments on May 16: Please do not touch German Mills. You can conduct experiments with Aerobic Bioreactor in abandoned landfields, but not in the highly populated area like German Mills.

Comments on May 16: Please do not touch German Mills. You can conduct experiments with Aerobic Bioreactor in abandoned landfields, but not in the highly populated area like German Mills.

Comments on May 16: Please do not disturb, or destroy this beautiful sanctuary in the name of money. It would be a tragedy.

Comment on May 15, 2012: This experiment should be conducted in a non-residential area. The former landfill is over 37 years old and most methane has released. I want Markham to show environmental leadership by protecting this green space from destruction and any proposed development. To protect the habitats for wildlife, the park should be left in it's natural state.

Comment on May 15: nature good, Aerobic Bioreactor Experiment in German Mills Park bad

Comment on May 15: please leave our park as it is

Comment on May 15: The German Mills park is the reason why I moved into my neighbourhood in Markham. It is a very nice park that draws a lot of different birds and animals. It makes me sick to think that this conservation area can be so easily destroyed when the area is so treasured by those who live around it and when it houses so much wildlife.

Commnets on May 6: Absolutely agree! If the mayor and his team want to be "environmental leaders", let them create this experimental nightmare at the backyard of their own homes, but let them not encroach on our right to live in a safe, calm, and clean place, which is the north-west side of German Mills Settlers Park, the former Sabiston landfill site, now.

Comments on April 24: This should be considered in a non residential area!

Comments on April 24: Yes this will have a huge negative impact on the parkland. The heat byproduct will kill the plants and therefore no animals will live there. The methane readings are at zero at the perimeter (landfill has been closed for almost 40 years, so most methane has been released).

This will cost the taxpayers more money, cause the water level in the creek to go down (from the pumping of the water for this process), involve construction, noise, odour, unnecessary carbon dioxide release etc. The area may be expanded and the whole area will be fenced off and unusable (20 acres) for up to 30 years. We will not be able to use that side of the park. The end definitely does not justify the means.

Comments on December 11, 2011: There is fear that this equipment will be noisy, producing an annoying sound that can be heard for some distance on a 24/7 basis for a number of years. If true, more thought must be given to the benefit with regard to the environmental cost (increased noise in the community). Shouldn't the air quality study and even ground leaching studies to determine the actual severity of these problems, be conducted before the Mayor starts bragging about how it will put Markham "on the map"? If this equipment will be disruptive, shouldn't more thought be given to the possibility of quieter equipment? The other local areas where this equipment is in use involve actual landfill sites, away from residential areas. This is on the border of several quiet, residential neighborhoods.

Attachment #2

Media and Other Informational Coverage

<http://germanmills.org/2012/06/07/media-sources-and-information-on-markham-town-aerobic-bioreactor-proposal-and-community-reaction-to-it/>

Click on the links below to see the full text of the article:

- Former Thornhill landfill eyed as habitat – June 13, 2012
- Mowing triggers community clean up
- Don't run experiment so close to our homes – June 4, 2012
- Markham project worries landfill's neighbors
- Residents voice frustrations at green space meeting
- Markham residents alarmed over proposed Sabiston landfill project
- Meeting on former Thornhill landfill postponed
- German Mills Settlers' Park Master Plan Proposal (Submitted on behalf of the Toronto Field Naturalists by Theresa Moore – December 19, 2005 updated May, 2012)
- Letter of Concern to the Town of Markham (Toronto Field Naturalists – May 15, 2012)
- Facts and Figures / Questions & Concerns
- German Mills Residents Association (GMRA) Aerobic Test Site

- Help Save German Mills Settlers Park!
- Economist & Sun: Residents voice frustrations at green space meeting
- The Applicability of Using Aerobic Technology for the Former Sabiston Landfill Site Public Information Meeting
- Former Sabiston Landfill Site Public Information Meeting and Indoor Air Quality (Town of Markham Staff Report, September 26, 2011)
- Flyer – Public Meeting Announcement (Save German Mills Settlers Park – May 2012)
- Sabiston Landfill Regeneration Update (Councillor Howard Shore, 23 February 2012)
- Sabiston Pilot Project – Rescheduling of Public Meeting Announcement & Responses to Some Resident Questions (Town of Markham, 28 May 2012)
- Sabiston Landfill Regeneration
- Aerobic Test Site
- Aerobic landfill proposed in Thornhill
- Letter of Concern to the Town of Markham (Toronto Field Naturalists – October 27, 2006)
- Letter of Concern to the Town of Markham (Toronto Field Naturalists – August 31, 2006)
- Petition to Stop Bioreactor Project Save German Mills Park
- Petition To Help Save German Mills Settlers' Park

Attachment #3

TFN Reports are attached as .pdf files

Attachment #4

Methane probe readings are attached as .pdf files

Attachment #5

Petitions

2 petitions are available online:

<http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/stop-bioreactor-sabiston-landfill-project-thornhil/> - 96 signatures

<http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/save-german-mills-settlers-park> - 200 signatures

The 3rd paper petition with over 300 signatures will be presented at the meeting.

Overall, we have over 500 unique signatures on these petitions!

Toronto Field Naturalists

1

2 Carlton Street, Suite 1519, Toronto, ON M5B 1J3

May 15, 2012

Councillor Howard Shore
Town of Markham
101 Town Centre Boulevard
Markham, ON
L3R 9W3

Dear Councillor Howard Shore,

On behalf of the Toronto Field Naturalists (TFN), I would like to thank you and your team for hosting the March 19th public meeting regarding the proposed aerobic landfill management strategy. Unfortunately, since I live half a block south of Steeles Avenue and have changed my e-mail address, I was unaware of the meeting until recently. The Toronto Field Naturalists also did not receive notice of meeting.

In 2005/2006 I attended the consultation meetings and prepared a detailed master plan proposal for German Mills Settlers' Park with input from other TFN members and Dennis Murray, the President/Founder of the Friends of Settlers' Park. Much of this report dealt with the area west of German Mills Creek (i.e. the landfill region). I also prepared two letters, submitted to Councillor Shapero, outlining the TFN position on progress made during consultations, our recommendations, and outstanding concerns.

I continue to walk in the park most days and to serve as a volunteer outing leader for the Toronto Field Naturalists. This has afforded me the opportunity to develop an intimate knowledge of the local plants and wildlife and thus a unique perspective on the potential benefits and adverse effects of recent and proposed activity.

Many of the Town of Markham representatives have changed since 2006. Therefore, I wanted to share the 2005/2006 documents and provide a response, on behalf of the TFN, to the content of minutes of the March, 2012 meeting. In particular, I am attaching the following TFN documents:

1. A letter with current (2012) comments, recommendations, questions, and concerns
2. The 2006 Settlers' Park Master Plan Proposal, (with 2012 updates in brackets and italics)
3. The October 27, 2006 letter to Councillor Shapero; and
4. The August 31, 2006 letter to Councillor Shapero

The goal of the Toronto Field Naturalists in this matter continues to be to preserve and enhance quality habitat for a diversity of plant, animal, and bird life during either maintenance of the existing landfill management system and/or any installation/operation of new systems. We appreciate the attention of you and other involved parties to the attached documents. We look forward to working with you during the consultative process and any subsequent activity in/near the park.

First, let me say that we are very pleased to see that there was much less emphasis on reforestation as a rationale for the current aerobic proposal. It would seem that our earlier efforts to educate people about the value of the locally rare meadow habitat were successful.

However, other recent and proposed activities put this habitat at risk. In particular, our current concerns and questions include:

1. Lack of consultation on minimizing habitat disturbance

By the end of consultations in 2006, we had confidence that there was a commitment to minimizing disturbance to wildlife and that the TFN would be given the opportunity to make recommendations relating to the timing, location etc. of any future activities along with the TRCA and other environmental consultants. However, within the past two years, the town added topsoil to a large area of the landfill site (west of the monitoring station) during the bird breeding/nesting season. The TFN was not consulted on this matter. It remains unclear what purpose the activity served and what, if anything, was actually accomplished.

We believe that the absence of vegetation in the affected area during the spring and early summer as well as the noise and presence of large machinery is largely responsible for the decline in the bobolink population in the park in 2011. While off-leash and off-trail use by hikers and dogs is also a growing concern which needs to be addressed, one would not expect such a dramatic decline in one year from this pedestrian activity.

The affected area, which was predominantly long and short grasses, now consists primarily of thistles and bare soil with some dandelions, queen ann's lace, and goldenrod. There are far fewer grasses, thus less cover for nesting birds.

In other areas of the province, the threat to the bobolink has been recognized (a 50% decline between from 1998 to 2008 due to habitat loss) and individuals with diverse interests have worked together to alter the mowing schedule of fields to help preserve bobolink populations (ON Nature, 2010).

2 Carlton Street, Suite 1519, Toronto, ON M5B 1J3

This type of collaboration could serve as a model for environmental leadership in the Town of Markham.

More recently, the TFN was not consulted or informed about the current aerobic landfill management proposal and public meeting. The area that has been targeted for the pilot project, while furthest away from housing, is (together with the area just to the west of it), the portion most frequented by the bobolinks and meadowlarks.

2. Effects of landfill heat on wildlife

We continue to be concerned about the effect of heat on the vegetation and on the wildlife that rely on this vegetation for cover, shelter, and food. The proposal indicates that a temperature of approximately 70 degrees Celcius will be generated by an aerobic process. Understandably, the temperature will not be uniform throughout the landfill. Can you provide data from other sites on the temperature in the upper 6" of the soil during aerobic management, including temperatures occurring when there is collapsing and cracking of the clay cap?

3. Effects of leachate

We remain committed to a 'leachate collection only' project as one option to reduce creek pollution and preserve habitat, provided this was installed and operated in a manner than minimized disruption to existing wildlife and vegetation. While we recognize that this will not accomplish the desired methane reduction, it would reduce water pollution and provide ongoing protection to the creek habitat. We are still awaiting details on the impact/disruption that an independent collection system would entail.

As decomposition accelerates with an aerobic process, more leachate will be produced. In 2006, the estimate of current leachate flow into the creek was 'garden hose volume.' Despite increasing discoloration of creek water and shores with iron, ongoing creek monitoring has demonstrated 'no measurable impact.'

Fish, including spawning salmon, exist in the creek and are sensitive to pollution, water levels, and temperature. Increases in the creek temperature or pollutant levels, or reduction of volume (from removal of water for the aerobic process) could adversely affect the fish, fish-eating birds (such as Kingfishers and Great Blue Herons) as well as ducks, mink, muskrat, and other mammals.

The proposal includes a plan to capture leachate and inject it into the landfill. In addition to our earlier questions about the impact of installing a collection

system, we have several other questions:

- (a) can you guarantee that no additional leachate (beyond current levels) will reach the creek and that the composition of the new leachate will not be more harmful to the creek than the existing leachate?;
- (b) is it possible to actually reduce the current amount of leachate which enters the creek?;
- (c) what is the temperature of the leachate that enters the creek now?;
- (d) what is the anticipated temperature of the leachate reaching the creek in the proposed system?; and
- (e) would monitoring of the creek occur with greater frequency and would it include temperature and depth?

- 4. Addition of clean fill to level out areas which have settled with accelerated decomposition

The recent experience with the addition of topsoil, described earlier, has demonstrated the problems with this process—disturbance of birds and other wildlife and a new vegetation mix less suitable to wildlife—unless it is done in late summer and native grasses are planted at the same time. There also remains the need to have vigilant monitoring and control of invasive species, such as garlic mustard and dog strangling vine, which thrive in disturbed soil.

Sincerely,

Theresa Moore
On behalf of the Toronto Field Naturalists

C.C.

Markham Mayor, Frank Scarpitti
Regional Councillor, Joe Li
Ward 1 Councillor, Valerie Burke
Supervisor, Business Systems Improvement, Asset Management Dept, Bob Penner
Professor, Seneca College, Jadeja, Mahipal
Consultant engineer, SPL Beatty & Associates, Brian Beatty
Secretary, German Mills Ratepayers Association, Eileen Liasi

German Mills Settlers' Park Master Plan Proposal

Submitted on behalf of the Toronto Field Naturalists
by Theresa Moore
December 19, 2005 (*updated May, 2012*)

Overview

This submission was first made by the Toronto Field Naturalists (TFN) in anticipation of an upcoming consultation on a new master plan for German Mills Settlers' Park, hereafter referred to as Settlers' Park. *This version, with updates indicated in italics and brackets, is submitted in response to the recent public meeting on the use of aerobic technology for the former Sabiston Landfill site.* The author, a local resident who walks in the park most days, is a Toronto Field Naturalist member and volunteer outing leader, and recipient of a Thornhill Community 2005 'Enny' Award for contributions to the environment.

In preparing this proposal, expertise was sought from several key TFN members, especially: Carol Sellers, Helen Juhola, and Boris Mather. Dennis Murray, chair of the Thornhill East Don Scouts and President/Founder of the Friends of Settlers' Park, also reviewed and contributed to the 2005 document. In addition, internet and print resources were consulted and these are available upon request. *Both the original and 2012 versions of this proposal were reviewed by the Toronto Field Naturalists' Board of Directors.*

While recommendations in this proposal address a wide range of issues, they should not be considered exhaustive. It would be valuable to seek input from other environmental organizations, including the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and the Markham (*York Region*) Environmental Alliance. Circulation of this proposal to the other environmental groups during the consultation process would avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

Where possible, the descriptions and recommendations in this proposal are organized geographically. Issues related to the west grasslands are dealt with first and in greatest detail, as this area is significant for ground nesting birds and **must** be protected from development. After brief introductory comments about the park, issues pertaining to the following areas are addressed:

- A. All of the park property west of German Mills Creek *including the Sabiston Landfill* (referred to as 'the west side')
- B. All of the park property east of German Mills Creek (referred to as 'the east side')
- C. German Mills Creek
- D. Additional recommendations

Where the recommendations involve very specific locations, the author has attempted to clearly describe these and, if possible, to indicate them on the aerial photos (see Appendices C and D). However, if any confusion remains about specific locations identified in the proposal, the author may be contacted for clarification.

The overall goal of the recommendations outlined in this proposal is to preserve and enhance quality habitat for a diversity of plant, animal, and bird life.

Settlers' Park is an important ecosystem that supports an abundance of flora and fauna. It is part of the East Don watershed and has potential path linkages into East Don Parklands and Duncan Mills Creek. As awareness of the diversity of wildlife in Settlers' Park grows, there have been an increasing number of birders and other naturalists visiting the park. While a complete inventory of all of the plants and creatures found in the park does not exist, and is beyond the scope of this proposal, accurate records of the 74 (75) bird species and 15 mammal species are included to give readers some sense of the richness and value of this resource (see Appendices A and B). The park is also home to amphibians and reptiles (including frogs, Snapping turtles, Garter Snakes, and Little Brown Snakes), several species of fish, and many varieties of insects. *In recent years, since the TRCA removed barriers downstream, salmon have also spawned in the creek.* Descriptions of, and recommendations for, the major park habitats that support the flora and fauna will now be outlined.

A. Preserve and enhance habitat on the west side of German Mills Creek

The large grassland on the west side of German Mills Creek, site of the former gravel pit and garbage dump, is a rare and important habitat. However, many are unaware of its significance and view it as 'wasteland' or 'area awaiting development/planting'—a perception which puts it and its inhabitants at risk. The large size and relative lack of disturbance from walkers and dogs make this area a rare habitat in the Toronto Area and a valuable nesting site for ground nesting birds. *There has been a gradual increase in off-trail and off-leash dog walking in recent years, which poses a threat to these ground nesters.*

The vegetation in this area consists of tall and short grasses, forbs (non-woody herbaceous plants with broad leaves, such as goldenrod, teasel, and asters), as well as a few scattered shrubs and trees. Along with areas on the east side of Settlers' Park which are mainly forested or mowed, this grassland contributes to a diversity of habitats within the park. This helps to create a healthy ecosystem and support diverse and abundant wildlife.

Several species of birds rely on this grassland for food, shelter, and/or nesting sites and, are rarely, if ever, found on the east side of Settlers' Park. These are described in Table 1. Readers are invited to consult a field guide to North American birds for illustrations and additional information about these species, many of which have quite attractive and unusual plumage.

Table 1. Birds Found Only on the West Side of the Park

| Species | Main Food Sources | Nesting Habits | Other Characteristics |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
| Bobolink | Spiders Grass and forb seeds Young fed insects almost exclusively | On the ground in tall grass or meadows | Known to nest in only 2 other locations in the Toronto area—other grasslands may be too small or too heavily used by humans and dogs. <i>Dramatic decline in numbers in 2011, likely due to the Town's addition of clean topsoil during nesting season.</i> |
| Eastern Meadowlark | Spiders Grass and forb seeds | On the ground in grasslands, fields, or savannahs | Uncommon in Toronto area (apart from mowed hydro corridors) |
| Savannah Sparrow | Spiders Grass seeds | On the ground | |
| Song Sparrow* | Grass and forb seeds Some berries | First brood on the ground, may use shrubs for second brood | |
| Great Horned Owl* | Rodents Rabbits Birds | In tall deciduous trees in forests | Needs large open fields for hunting as each young owl eats up to 18 mice/day; daytime roost in tall conifers |
| Northern Shrike | Rodents Large insects Birds | Northern Canada | Winter visitor only; Uncommon in Toronto area |
| Red-Tailed Hawk* | Rodents | In tall trees (usually deciduous) in woodland and open country with scattered trees | Hunts while soaring, hovering, or perched; often seen perched on hydro poles in park |
| Sharp-Shinned Hawk | Mostly birds | Tall deciduous trees in forest | Hunts while hovering or perched |
| American Kestrel | Rodents Occasional birds | In cavities of standing dead trees | Hunts while hovering or perched in open habitat with scattered trees |
| Northern Mockingbird | Crayfish and snails Sowbugs Berries Young fed insects almost exclusively | Shrubs and vines | Uncommon in Toronto area |

* species which are very occasionally seen on the east side of the park as well.

In addition, the Toronto area is located on a major migratory flyway connecting to larger continental ecosystems. Therefore, small flocks of Warblers, White-Throated and White-Crowned Sparrows, and other birds are seen in the park for several weeks each Spring and Fall. These migratory birds are found in greater numbers on the west side of the park, where they feed on insects and/or seeds of the tall grasses and forbs.

Butterflies are also much more abundant on the west side of the park. This is partly because they require sunlight in order to elevate their body temperature to fly. While sunlight is also available in mowed park areas on the east side, there are far fewer food sources there. The west grasslands (as well as the vegetation along the paved south entrance) contain more nectar-rich wildflowers, such as Vetch, Teasel, Thistle, and Queen Anne's Lace. The butterflies also benefit from the large un-fragmented habitat of the grasslands, which reduces inbreeding and helps preserve genetic diversity. The most common butterflies in the park, along with their larval food sources, are listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Most Common Butterfly Species and their Larval Food Sources

| Butterfly Species | Main Larval Food Source |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Monarch | Milkweed |
| Red Admiral | Stinging Nettle |
| Clouded Sulphur | Alfalfa and clover |
| Cabbage White | Mustards |
| Silvery Blue | Common Vetch |
| Mourning Cloak | Elm, Birch, Willow (shrub) |
| Painted Lady | Thistles |
| European Skipper | Grasses |

To preserve and enhance the grassland habitat on the west side of the park, the following recommendations are made:

Recommendation A1: Maintain the large undisturbed grassland in its present state. This means that **no additional planting, development, (*top soil addition*) or trail construction should occur** (except for plantings in the small areas specified in the next two recommendations). Such activities would disturb and fragment the existing habitat and likely lead to the abandonment of this nesting area by Bobolinks and other ground nesting birds.

Recommendation A2: Plant along the existing trails and park perimeter.

Such planting (indicated by green lines in Appendix C) would provide additional food, shelter, and nesting sites, without undue disturbance of wildlife and would discourage dog and vehicle traffic off of trails. Since diversity in foliage height is known to correlate with diversity in bird species, these plantings would also enhance biodiversity. These plantings should extend **no more than 5 meters** from the existing trails or park perimeter. Expert consultation may be beneficial to determine the exact dimensions of the previous dump site as well as what species can survive the soil and air conditions that

exist in the aftermath of that activity. Native species should be used and should include the plants listed in Table 3:

Table 3: Recommended Plantings along West Trails and Perimeter

| Recommended Plantings | Properties |
|-----------------------|--|
| Milkweed | Attract and support Monarch butterflies |
| Sumac | Known to survive in the area; long branch life of fruit makes it an important food source in March and April |
| Pearly Everlasting | Provides larval food for American Lady butterflies |
| Willow | Known to survive in the area; attracts insects which provide food for birds |
| Dogwood | Provides nesting sites for Yellow Warblers and Savannah Sparrows; provides food for many birds |
| Serviceberry | Provides food and shelter for birds and butterflies; not invasive and provides dappled shade |
| Stinging Nettle | Provides larval food for Red Admiral butterflies |
| Crab Apple | Provides food and nesting sites for several bird species |
| Yew | Berries provide food for Chipmunks and Yellow-rumped Warblers |

Recommendation A3: Extend the northern edge of the forested area.

Plant a 5 meter band of mixed tall coniferous and deciduous trees near the southern end of the west path. Plantings would begin where the hydro lines cross over the trail and extend from the dirt path east to the creek. This area is indicated by the heading ‘new forest’ in hard copies of Appendix C (or by a blue rectangle in e-copies). This would provide additional nesting, feeding, or perching sites for woodpeckers and birds of prey. Preferred species for optimal bird habitat would include *native species of*: Pine, Spruce, Birch, Speckled Alder, Hickory, Oak, and Musclewood. The newly forested area should then be bordered with a 3 meter band of plants chosen from Table 3.

Recommendation A4: Protect wildlife and plants during planting.

When planting, measures should be taken to minimize disturbance to wildlife and to ensure the survival of the plants. These measures include:

- a) Planting in early September to avoid disturbing nesting birds and to decrease water requirements of new transplants.
 - b) Prohibiting vehicle traffic (outside of existing trails) to transport plants or to water/maintain them.
 - c) Making adequate provisions for the maintenance requirements of new transplants.
- Until they become well established, new plantings require mulching, watering, pruning, staking, and removal of invasive vines. It is recommended that the town work with the TRCA, and the stewardship groups to allocate these responsibilities in a manner which does not put an undue burden on any one individual or group.

Recommendation A5: Erect perches for birds of prey in the grassland.

Four to six man-made perches, erected outside of nesting season and at some distance from the trail and existing hydro poles, would provide additional hunting opportunities for birds of prey. Instructions for constructing raptor perches can be found at www.inhs.uiuc.edu/~kenr/birdperchinstruct.html

Recommendation A6: Erect Nesting Boxes for American Kestrel and Screech Owls.

Boxes should be attached to a tree or post at a forest edge adjacent to the grassland, at a height of 3-9 meters and, if possible, under a tree limb. Detailed construction plans for the boxes can be found at www.birds.cornell.edu/birdhouse/bhbasics/boxamke.pdf

Recommendation A7: Request TFN assistance if a vegetation inventory is needed.

If an inventory of existing vegetation is required for planning or monitoring, request that the Toronto Field Naturalists assist with this task in the Spring or Summer.

Recommendation A8: Find a permanent solution to the southwest entrance erosion.

(The strategies offered were implemented, specifically, digging a trench and using large boulders. This has provided a longer lasting solution to the erosion). [With heavy rains, water flows into the dirt trail at south west entrance of the park from the adjacent hill on the property of the National Baha'i Centre. This causes large crevices in the trail, which in the past have reached over a meter in depth and required repair with large amounts of soil. This problem will recur over time—in fact, in the few months since the last repair a 15 cm deep crevice has developed. These crevices pose a safety hazard for park users, especially in winter when they may be hidden by snow cover. A storm sewer might offer a permanent, though costly solution. A less expensive solution may be to dig a shallow trench extending down to the creek so that the water can be diverted. Expert consultation could help to determine the most effective and cost-effective solution.]

B. Preserve and enhance habitat on the east side of German Mills Creek

Vegetation on the east side of the park is composed primarily of forest and mowed grass. There are also some small meadow-like areas of shrubs, tall grasses, and forbs along the edges of the main trail and creek, including plantings by the Thornhill East Don Scouts Group. A gravel and dirt trail runs along the creek from the bridge north to John Street. This trail surface is desirable as it is less prone to icing and provides better traction in winter than pavement. The proximity of the trail to the water and the biodiversity that occurs where two habitats meet (known as the 'edge effect') makes for good wildlife viewing. The mowed areas support very few species (mostly Robins, Earthworms, Northern Flickers, Gray Squirrels, and Eastern Cottontail Rabbits). However, these areas are well used by dog walkers, families, and children on toboggans.

To preserve and enhance the habitat on the east side of the park, the following recommendations are made:

Recommendation B1: Provide additional seating.

The existing bench and gazebo near the bridge are well used. A second gazebo would provide an additional rest stop. *(The gazebo and bench were removed, presumably*

because of litter from drinking parties and vandalism in this area). The preferred location would be the large mowed area, approximately at the half-way point of the east trail (see Appendix C). If there are insufficient funds for a gazebo, a bench or picnic table would be suitable. Materials that are resistant to vandalism and that cannot be used for firewood are recommended.

Recommendation B2: Clean nesting boxes yearly.

The contents of *all* nesting boxes should be removed each September and the boxes thoroughly brushed and scraped out. This will allow monitoring of occupancy and will rid the boxes of parasites so that they are habitable for nesting birds the following Spring.

Recommendation B3: Consider leveling and replanting dirt mounds near trail.

In the area just north of the proposed seating there are some unsightly dirt mounds between the trail and the creek. These may have been created by a backhoe when the pipes were laid. Dennis Murray had discussed the possibility of leveling and landscaping these areas with Karen Boniface of the Town of Markham *around 2005*. If soil testing indicates that this is an option and the work can be done with little or no disruption to areas between mounds, then the TFN would support this plan and recommend that these areas be planted with species selected from Table 3 in order to maximize feeding, nesting, and shelter opportunities for wildlife.

C. Preserve and enhance the habitat of German Mills Creek

The creek meanders through the park, with depth and flow varying according to rainfall received. Erosion of the banks is visible in many locations and occasional flooding occurs in some areas. Stabilization efforts have included shrub plantings and the addition of boulders near the north and south entrances. Several species of fish live in the creek and Salmon spawn there. The creek is also home to Snapping Turtles, Mallard Ducks, Muskrat, Beaver, Mink, Crayfish, and a variety of insects. Herons and Kingfishers feed on the fish, while many other birds drink from, and bathe in, the creek.

To preserve and enhance the creek habitat, the following recommendations are made:

Recommendation C1: Explore culvert widening to reduce flooding and erosion.

The culvert that contains the creek at the south end of the park between the Leslie Street Pumping Station and the *Adventure Valley* property is approximately 1 meter in diameter. It restricts water flow along the creek and contributes to flooding and erosion. The effects of this could clearly be seen after the storm in the summer of 2005. Consultation with engineers about the possibility of widening this culvert is strongly recommended.

Recommendation C2: Inspect creek annually for debris and remove *except to the degree that TRCA advises leaving the debris to preserve fish nesting habitat.*

Logjams, fallen trees, and other large debris (*such as shopping carts and wooden pallets*) periodically collect along the creek contributing to flooding and further erosion. Regularly scheduled inspection would detect such accumulations.

Recommendation C3: Monitor water samples regularly.

Ongoing monitoring of water samples from the creek for pollutants could identify trends, help in tracking progress of other environmental initiatives, and potentially promote rapid response to any contamination. This in turn would enhance the health of the creek and the creatures that live, feed, or spawn there.

D. Additional recommendations to preserve and enhance park habitat.

Recommendation D1: Add additional signage at park entrances and along trails.

Several types of signage are recommended:

a) Information about birds, animals, and plants found in the park.

The purpose of this signage would be twofold—to educate park users about the ecosystem and to invite them to use their senses to become more aware of the beauty and abundance of life in the park. The Toronto Field Naturalists would be happy to assist in developing the text for these signs.

b) Information about preserving the environment.

All six park entrances should have signage indicating that removal of plants, wildlife, and any other matter is prohibited (similar signs already exist at the north east entrance). This may help to deter the fish and plant harvesting which occurs in the park. Signs indicating the presence of ground nesting birds and prohibiting off-leash *and off-trail* activities on the west side of the creek should also be erected. *This recommendation has taken on increased importance as the frequency of these activities has increased.* To reduce litter and overflowing garbage bins, consideration should also be given to including content about “taking out empty, what you bring in full.”

c) Information about the methane burning apparatus.

This would be educational and would perhaps give visitors new insight into the merits of reducing, reusing, and recycling.

d) Information about the trails and safety.

This would include such data as trail locations, distances, links to other parks, and locations of the nearest phones and washrooms.

Given the history of vandalism of park signs and plaques, consideration would need to be given to choosing a material for the signs that is relatively resistant to such damage.

Recommendation D2: Continue the practice of leaving dead trees untouched.

Currently dead and fallen trees are left untouched in the park unless they obstruct the main trails. This is a helpful practice as these trees provide food and habitat for birds and insects. For example, Red-breasted Nuthatches and Northern Flickers nest in cavities of dead trees along the east trail. The insects which colonize these trees also provide food for a variety of Woodpeckers. The holes created by these nesting or feeding birds also create shelter for tiny birds, such as Chickadees and Kinglets, on extremely cold winter nights. This is important to the survival of these small creatures, which have proportionally larger surface areas and heat loss.

Recommendation D3: Install additional garbage bins.

New garbage bins at the northwest entrance, *southeast entrance*, *bridge*, and by the concrete blocks at the southwest entrance to the park would help to reduce litter. If the trial of the recently installed larger, buried bin by the gazebo is successful, consideration should be given to adding more of these bins as well as to increasing year-round use of existing bins. *This bin was removed, possibly due to vandalism.*

Recommendation D4: Manage invasive species.

Some plants and animals can be invasive or harmful to the park ecosystem. Invasive plants displace native species and reduce genetic diversity. Invasive plants found in Settler's Park include Dog Strangling Vine), Norway Maple, European Buckthorn, and Garlic Mustard. Since new knowledge and innovative control methods are continually emerging, direction should be sought each year from the TRCA about best practices in managing these species and preventing further introductions. This information should then be disseminated to the stewardship groups who, after receiving appropriate field training, could assume considerable responsibility for implementation. *If Dog Strangling Vine or Garlic Mustard took hold in disturbed soil on the west side, this could easily spread quickly to include most of this area.*

Another concern is invasion of insects which damage and/or kill trees, notably the Asian Long-horned Beetle and Emerald Ash Borer. Again, the TRCA should be consulted annually about best practices for monitoring and control of these pests and about any emerging threats.

Finally, from time to time, beaver cut trees and saplings along the creek and attempt to build a dam near the bridge. These dams have been detected and removed before they can cause flooding. In addition to continuing with this practice, it is recommended that the stewardship groups (*continue to*) be provided with chicken wire to surround and protect tree trunks.

Recommendation D5: Recognize/support conservation by adjacent property owners.

The relative lack of development on adjacent properties owned by The National Baha'i Centre, Bayview Country Club, and *Adventure Valley (owned by the National Baha'I Association)* contribute to the biodiversity that exists within the park. For example, the Great Horned Owls and Red-Tailed Hawks likely nest in the tall conifers on the Baha'i property, while muskrat and beaver travel and feed along the creek within and beyond park boundaries. Measures to recognize and encourage continued preservation of these habitats should be explored.

Appendix A
 Birds Seen in German Mills Settlers' Park (74 (75) species)
 (Observed by T. Moore and/or other TFN members)

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Great Blue Heron | Northern Shrike |
| Black-Crowned Night-Heron | European Starling |
| Canada Goose | Blue-headed Vireo |
| Mallard | Philadelphia Vireo |
| <i>Wood Duck</i> | Red-eyed Vireo |
| Turkey Vulture | Yellow Warbler |
| Northern Harrier | Magnolia Warbler |
| Sharp-Shinned Hawk | Black-throated Green Warbler |
| Cooper's Hawk | Bay-breasted Warbler |
| Red-Tailed Hawk | Black and White Warbler |
| American Kestrel | American Redstart |
| Spotted Sandpiper | Canada Warbler |
| Ring-billed Gull | Scarlet Tanager |
| Rock Pigeon | Northern Cardinal |
| Mourning Dove | Rose-breasted Grosbeak |
| Great Horned Owl | Indigo Bunting |
| Common Nighthawk | American Tree Sparrow |
| Chimney Swift | Chipping Sparrow |
| Ruby-Throated Hummingbird | Savannah Sparrow |
| Belted Kingfisher | Song Sparrow |
| Downy Woodpecker | Swamp Sparrow |
| Hairy Woodpecker | White-throated Sparrow |
| Northern Flicker | White-crowned Sparrow |
| Pileated Woodpecker | Dark-Eyed Junco |
| Eastern Pheobe | Bobolink |
| Eastern Kingbird | Red-winged Blackbird |
| Northern Rough-winged Swallow | Eastern Meadowlark |
| Barn Swallow | Common Grackle |
| Blue Jay | Brown-headed Cowbird |
| American Crow | Northern Oriole |
| Black-capped Chickadee | House Finch |
| Red-breasted Nuthatch | American Goldfinch |
| White-breasted Nuthatch | House Sparrow |
| Brown Creeper | |
| Winter Wren | |
| Golden-crowned Kinglet | |
| Ruby-crowned Kinglet | |
| Eastern Bluebird | |
| American Robin | |
| Gray Catbird | |
| Northern Mockingbird | |
| Cedar Waxwing | |

Appendix B
Mammals Seen in German Mills Settlers' Park (15 species)
(Observed by T. Moore and/or other TFN members)

Whitetail Deer
Coyote
Red Fox
Mink
Weasel
Beaver
Muskrat
Eastern Cottontail Rabbit
Raccoon
Red Squirrel
Gray Squirrel
Chipmunk
Mouse
Vole
Little Brown Bat

Commentary on Methane Production

The following is my summary of the methane readings provided to me by Councillor Howard Shore.

Readings from March 18, 2010 to December 2, 2011

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| Western header (7 probes) | Average reading 0.4% | All zero since August 28, 2011 |
| Northern Subheader (2 probes) | Average reading 0.03% | All zero since August 17, 2011 |
| Northern Main Header (6 probes) | Average reading 0.17% | ≤ 0.1% since August 17, 2011 Remove 1 anomalous reading and average drops to 0.03% |
| South side of Property (6 probes) | Average reading 11.8% | ≤ 0.7% on December 2, 2011 the last available data. |

One probe, GP2-10, has shown a number of relatively high readings.

One probe, GP7-10, has shown one reading of 14.7%, and all other readings below 6.0%.

All the other probes have had **all** their readings below 6%.

Readings from January 24, 2012 to April 23, 2012

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Western header (7 probes) | All readings zero |
| Northern Subheader (2 probes) | All readings zero |
| Northern Main Header (6 probes) | Average reading 0.28% |
| South side of Property (6 probes) | Average reading 3.57% |

Monitoring has been largely discontinued at three headers

Monitoring has been largely discontinued at the Western Header, Northern Subheader, and the Northern Main Header. At these locations, only two readings have been taken this year. I have not been provided with an explanation for discontinuing more frequent readings, but it seems reasonable to assume that it is because the levels being recorded were trivially low. **Why was this not divulged at the Public Meeting?**

The only part of the property which is still being regularly monitored is the “South Side of Property.” The average reading for this year, for that site, is only 30% as high as it was for the period from March 18, 2010 to the end of last year. (The average reading is now 3.57%, while the previous average was 11.8%.)

For how long do landfill sites emit methane? The consultants at the public meeting said on numerous occasions that methane would or could be emitted for 100 years or more.

The report, EPA 430-R-12-001, "Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 – 2010" states:

'Significant CH₄ production typically begins one or two years after waste disposal in a landfill and continues for 10 to 60 years or longer.'

The consultants seem to have given a high estimate. It is possible the former Sabiston landfill is already well past its period of significant methane production. Indeed, the methane readings suggest to me that is very likely the case.

Total Methane Production

At the Public Meeting, we were told the purpose of the Aerobic Scheme was to prevent methane production, because it is a greenhouse gas. Since there are financial and environmental costs to implement the scheme, it can only be justified if there is a net environmental benefit. The fundamental question is: *'Are the costs involved justified by the reduction in methane production?'*

The most optimistic scenario is that implementation of the scheme would reduce current methane production rates to zero. The current methane production rate could be estimated from knowledge of the gas flow from the headers to the atmosphere multiplied by the average concentration of methane in the gas flow. We know the concentrations of methane in three of the headers are negligible. At the South Side of the Property the concentration is low. However, it is not possible to calculate total methane production from this part of the site because, apparently, the gas flow rates are not known. **Why have they not been measured?**

And how can anyone justify an expensive and environmentally disruptive aerobic scheme without having any idea of the potential benefit?

Bob James.

May 7, 2012

APPENDIX C - HISTORICAL LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | Methane (MCH4) | | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) | Oxygen (NO2) | Methane (MCH4) | Carbon Dioxide (NCO2) |
|--------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|
|--------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|

Not manufactured
under license

APPENDIX C - HISTORICAL LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

[illegible]

| Model | Not modelled |
|-----------|--------------|
| Model 1 | |
| Model 2 | |
| Model 3 | |
| Model 4 | |
| Model 5 | |
| Model 6 | |
| Model 7 | |
| Model 8 | |
| Model 9 | |
| Model 10 | |
| Model 11 | |
| Model 12 | |
| Model 13 | |
| Model 14 | |
| Model 15 | |
| Model 16 | |
| Model 17 | |
| Model 18 | |
| Model 19 | |
| Model 20 | |
| Model 21 | |
| Model 22 | |
| Model 23 | |
| Model 24 | |
| Model 25 | |
| Model 26 | |
| Model 27 | |
| Model 28 | |
| Model 29 | |
| Model 30 | |
| Model 31 | |
| Model 32 | |
| Model 33 | |
| Model 34 | |
| Model 35 | |
| Model 36 | |
| Model 37 | |
| Model 38 | |
| Model 39 | |
| Model 40 | |
| Model 41 | |
| Model 42 | |
| Model 43 | |
| Model 44 | |
| Model 45 | |
| Model 46 | |
| Model 47 | |
| Model 48 | |
| Model 49 | |
| Model 50 | |
| Model 51 | |
| Model 52 | |
| Model 53 | |
| Model 54 | |
| Model 55 | |
| Model 56 | |
| Model 57 | |
| Model 58 | |
| Model 59 | |
| Model 60 | |
| Model 61 | |
| Model 62 | |
| Model 63 | |
| Model 64 | |
| Model 65 | |
| Model 66 | |
| Model 67 | |
| Model 68 | |
| Model 69 | |
| Model 70 | |
| Model 71 | |
| Model 72 | |
| Model 73 | |
| Model 74 | |
| Model 75 | |
| Model 76 | |
| Model 77 | |
| Model 78 | |
| Model 79 | |
| Model 80 | |
| Model 81 | |
| Model 82 | |
| Model 83 | |
| Model 84 | |
| Model 85 | |
| Model 86 | |
| Model 87 | |
| Model 88 | |
| Model 89 | |
| Model 90 | |
| Model 91 | |
| Model 92 | |
| Model 93 | |
| Model 94 | |
| Model 95 | |
| Model 96 | |
| Model 97 | |
| Model 98 | |
| Model 99 | |
| Model 100 | |

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) |
|----------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | 24-Jan-12 | 24-Jan-12 | 24-Jan-12 | 24-Feb-12 | 24-Feb-12 | 24-Feb-12 |
| Western Header | GP1-96 (D) | | | | 0.0 | 10.6 | 8.5 |
| | GP1-96 (S) | | | | 0.0 | 0.2 | 22.2 |
| | GP9-00 | | | | 0.0 | 14.6 | 5.6 |
| | GP2-96(D) | | | | 0.0 | 0.7 | 22.4 |
| | GP2-96(S) | | | | 0.0 | 0.7 | 22.5 |
| | GP8-00 | | | | 0.0 | 0.7 | 21.8 |
| | GP3-96 | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.8 |
| | GP6-00 | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.7 |
| Northern Subheader | GP3-00 | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.6 |
| | GP7-00 | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.5 |
| | GP5-00 | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.3 |
| Northern Main Header | GP2-00 | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.4 |
| | GP1-00 | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.3 |
| | GP4-00 | | | | 4.7 | 16.7 | 2.3 |
| | GP1-10 | | | | 0.0 | 0.4 | 20.6 |
| | GP2-10 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.2 | 21.6 | 23.3 | 0.0 |
| South Side of Property | GP1-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.6 | 1.4 | 3.3 | 17.5 |
| | GP1-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.6 | 17.4 | 18.1 | 1.7 |
| | GP2-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.0 | 8.8 | 12.5 | 7.0 |
| | GP2-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.2 | 13.9 | 18.9 | 0.0 |
| | GP2-11(D) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.3 | 14.4 | 17.5 | 1.1 |

TO110010 - 2012 Landfill Gas Monitoring Report

Former Sabiston Landfill, Markham, Ontario

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) |
|--|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | 27-Feb-12 | 27-Feb-12 | 27-Feb-12 | 02-Mar-12 | 02-Mar-12 | 02-Mar-12 |
| Western Header | GP1-96 (D) | | | | | | |
| | GP1-96 (S) | | | | | | |
| | GP9-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(D) | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(S) | | | | | | |
| | GP8-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP3-96 | | | | | | |
| | GP6-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Subheader | GP3-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP7-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP5-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Main Header | GP2-00 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.8 | | | |
| | GP1-00 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 21.3 | | | |
| | GP4-00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.0 |
| | GP1-10 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 22.1 | | | |
| South Side of Property | GP2-10 | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.0 |
| | GP1-11(S) | 0.4 | 0.9 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.8 |
| | GP1-11(I) | 15.0 | 15.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.9 |
| | GP2-11(S) | 7.7 | 9.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.3 |
| | GP2-11(I) | 13.8 | 17.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.5 |
| TO110010 - 2012 Landfill Gas Monitoring Report | | 12.4 | 15.7 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 |

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) |
|--|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | 05-Mar-12 | 05-Mar-12 | 05-Mar-12 | 09-Mar-12 | 09-Mar-12 | 09-Mar-12 |
| Western Header | GP1-96 (D) | | | | | | |
| | GP1-96 (S) | | | | | | |
| | GP9-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(D) | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(S) | | | | | | |
| | GP8-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP3-96 | | | | | | |
| | GP6-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Subheader | GP3-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP7-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP5-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Main Header | GP2-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP4-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-10 | | | | | | |
| South Side of Property | GP2-10 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.9 |
| | GP1-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.2 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 |
| | GP1-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.2 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.8 |
| | GP2-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.2 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.8 |
| | GP2-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.2 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.8 |
| TO110010 - 2012 Landfill Gas Monitoring Report | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.8 |

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) |
|------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | 12-Mar-12 | 12-Mar-12 | 12-Mar-12 | 16-Mar-12 | 16-Mar-12 | 16-Mar-12 |
| Western Header | GP1-96 (D) | | | | | | |
| | GP1-96 (S) | | | | | | |
| | GP9-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(D) | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(S) | | | | | | |
| | GP8-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP3-96 | | | | | | |
| | GP6-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Subheader | GP3-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP7-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Main Header | GP5-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP2-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP4-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-10 | | | | | | |
| South Side of Property | GP2-10 | 14.2 | 20.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 |
| | GP1-11(S) | 2.9 | 3.4 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 |
| | GP1-11(I) | 15.0 | 15.8 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 |
| | GP2-11(S) | 11.4 | 15.1 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 21.4 |
| | GP2-11(I) | 13.7 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.8 |
| GP2-11(P) | | 12.3 | 15.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.7 |

TQ110010 - 2012 Landfill Gas Monitoring Report

Former Sabiston Landfill, Markham, Ontario

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) |
|------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | 19-Mar-12 | 19-Mar-12 | 19-Mar-12 | 23-Mar-12 | 23-Mar-12 | 23-Mar-12 |
| Western Header | GP1-96 (D) | | | | | | |
| | GP1-96 (S) | | | | | | |
| | GP9-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(D) | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(S) | | | | | | |
| | GP8-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP3-96 | | | | | | |
| | GP6-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Subheader | GP3-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP7-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP5-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Main Header | GP2-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP4-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-10 | | | | | | |
| | GP2-10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.0 |
| South Side of Property | GP1-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 |
| | GP1-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 21.6 |
| | GP2-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 21.4 |
| | GP2-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.4 |
| | GP2-11(D) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 |

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) |
|--|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | 29-Mar-12 | 29-Mar-12 | 29-Mar-12 | 02-Apr-12 | 02-Apr-12 | 02-Apr-12 |
| Western Header | GP1-96 (D) | | | | | | |
| | GP1-96 (S) | | | | | | |
| | GP9-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(D) | | | | | | |
| | GP2-96(S) | | | | | | |
| | GP8-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP3-96 | | | | | | |
| | GP6-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Subheader | GP3-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP7-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP5-00 | | | | | | |
| Northern Main Header | GP2-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP4-00 | | | | | | |
| | GP1-10 | | | | | | |
| South Side of Property | GP2-10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 21.3 |
| | GP1-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 21.6 |
| | GP1-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 21.5 |
| | GP2-11(S) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.2 |
| | GP2-11(I) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 21.2 |
| TO110010 - 2012 Landfill Gas Monitoring Report | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 21.1 |

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LANDFILL GAS MONITORING DATA - BOUNDARY GAS PROBES

| Boundary Gas Probe | | Methane (%CH ₄) | Carbon Dioxide (%CO ₂) | Oxygen (%O ₂) |
|----------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | 23-Apr-12 | 23-Apr-12 | 23-Apr-12 |
| Western Header | GP1-96 (D) | 0.0 | 12.3 | 6.5 |
| | GP1-96 (S) | 0.0 | 2.5 | 18.0 |
| | GP9-00 | 0.0 | 16.3 | 3.9 |
| | GP2-96(D) | 0.0 | 12.3 | 6.5 |
| | GP2-96(S) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.0 |
| | GP8-00 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 20.3 |
| | GP3-96 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 20.6 |
| Northern Subheader | GP6-00 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.0 |
| | GP3-00 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 19.9 |
| | GP7-00 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 17.3 |
| Northern Main Header | GP5-00 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.3 |
| | GP2-00 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 20.7 |
| | GP1-00 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 20.5 |
| | GP4-00 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 20.7 |
| | GP1-10 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.2 |
| South Side of Property | GP2-10 | 22.4 | 23.5 | 0.3 |
| | GP1-11(S) | 0.9 | 2.2 | 18.8 |
| | GP1-11(I) | 16.5 | 18.7 | 0.3 |
| | GP2-11(S) | 11.6 | 16.4 | 1.8 |
| | GP2-11(I) | 13.6 | 18.1 | 0.0 |
| | GP2-11(D) | 12.8 | 18.0 | 0.0 |

20

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Re.In support of Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

From: Joseph So

Sent: June 20, 2012 2:52 PM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: fccarpitti@markham.ca; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Re.In support of Councilor Shore's Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat (The Former Sabiston Landfill)

Dear Councilor Shore,

We support your Motion on Settlers Park Meadow and Natural Habitat 100%. We want Council to make a decision on June 26th and don't want this issue to be deferred to a later date.

We oppose the aerobic proposal and wish to continue with the current anaerobic/conventional technology and have additional methane monitoring measures added to the current system.

Yours truly,

Joseph & Judy So

21

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Support Councillor Howard Shore's Motion

From: Mike Oberpichler

Sent: June 21, 2012 7:14 AM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public; Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Cc: pozdniakov.artem@gmail.com

Subject: Support Councillor Howard Shore's Motion

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

I support Howard Shore's motion. This is an **optional** experiment in a residential area on a 37 year old landfill. This technology is simply in the wrong place at the wrong time and involves unnecessary spending, distress to the community and destruction of habitat.

Please listen to the community who have been expressing for over six years they are not interested in this project. Why is Markham still trying to push this through? There are no safety concerns with the current monitoring system. Does Seneca realize this area houses habitat for threatened bird species? I think when they find out they will not be willing to tarnish their reputation on a ethically questionable experiment, on so many levels.

Please respect the wishes of the community and vote to support Councillor's Shore's motion to turn this land into protected parkland on June 26, at the Town meeting. Do not delay, protect this habitat for the diversity of animals that live here and for the people to enjoy this parkland. I encourage you to do the right thing and continue to show Markham as an environmental leader by keeping this meadow natural.

Mike Oberpichler
Pine Knoll Gate, Thornhill

22

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Councillor Shore's motion on the Settler's park

From: nevzat gürmen

Sent: June 21, 2012 2:26 PM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public; Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan;

info@germanmills.org; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Councillor Shore's motion on the Settler's park

My name is Nevzat Gurmen. I am resident at 61 Dawn Hill Trail. I would like to inform you that I fully support Councillor Shore's motion. I trust the Council will review and approve this motion on June 26, 2012 without deferring it to any later date.

Many thanks to Councillor Shore and others supporting this motion at the Council.

Kind regards

Nevzat Gurmen, CMA

VP Finance and CFO, Durham College

23

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Proposed Aerobic Bioreactor at former Sabiston landfill

From: Brian Dahlback

Sent: June 21, 2012 5:25 PM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Cc: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; info@germanmills.org; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Proposed Aerobic Bioreactor at former Sabiston landfill

To : Mayor Scarpitti, Council Members et al :

Please be aware that I fully support Councillor Shore's motion to cancel, **PERMANENTLY**, the proposed Aerobic Bioreactor project at the former Sabiston landfill site.

There is no justification for further deferring of this issue, not until September or any time in the future. Six years of debate, research and dissemination of information, both thorough and factual, by all concerned, has enabled local residents to make a rational and informed decision : we are strongly opposed to the proposed experiment. The current system of methane monitoring is more than sufficient to inspire comfort and confidence in area residents.

Like most, if not all, Markham residents, I would prefer to see Markham's global image be that of a jurisdiction with a consistent and exemplary reputation for the preservation of greenspaces and rare natural habitats. I do not want the world to look upon us as an uncaring, third-world-style ecological despoiler.

I thank you for your time and consideration and trust that you will see your way clear to support Councillor Shore's motion.

Regards,
Brian Dahlback

24

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Settlers Park

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: June 21, 2012 7:54 PM

To: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Subject: Settlers Park

We do NOT support, and object to, the proposal for aerobic bioreactor on this precious greenbelt site.

We do support Councillor Shore's motion to end this initiative.

Robert and Teddene Long

Thornhill

Sent from my BlackBerry® wireless device

25

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: German Mills

From:

Sent: June 21, 2012 8:03 PM

To: Shore, Howard

Cc: Clerks Public

Subject: German Mills

We support Howard Shore's motion to designate the Settler's Park area as a Meadow and Natural Habitat

Brian and Denise Dunn
Thornhill, Ontario

(26)

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Support Councillor Shore's Motion - STOP THE AEROBIC BIOREACTOR PILOT PROJECT IN OUR GREEN SPACE

From: Tim He

Sent: June 21, 2012 10:16 PM

To: Shore, Howard; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Li, Joe; Burke, Valerie; Shore, Howard; milton@markham.ca; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Ho, Alan; Kanapathi, Logan; iu@markham.ca

Cc: Clerks Public

Subject: Support Councillor Shore's Motion - STOP THE AEROBIC BIOREACTOR PILOT PROJECT IN OUR GREEN SPACE

June 20, 2012

Dear Councillors,

It has been over 37 years since the closure of the Sabiston Landfill in the German Mills area of Thornhill. Since that time this area has clearly become a 'green-space' and is used by many on a daily basis for hiking or just observing the wonderful natural space and wildlife which have come to consider this area their home.

The vegetation in this area consists of tall and short grasses, forbs (non-woody herbaceous plants with broad leaves, such as goldenrod, teasel, and asters), as well as a few scattered shrubs and trees. Along with areas on the east side of Settlers' Park which are mainly forested or mowed, this grassland contributes to a diversity of habitats within the park.

Over 70 bird species and 15 mammal species have been identified in this area, making it a rich and valuable resource. This site is also home to amphibians and reptiles (including frogs, Snapping turtles, Garter Snakes, and Little Brown Snakes), several species of fish, and many varieties of insects. In recent years salmon have also spawned in the German Mills Creek.

Markham's own Greenprint Sustainability Plan states: "we value and restore the natural environment and protect biodiversity, natural capital and ecosystem services."

We fully support and endorse the Motion tabled by Councillor Shore on June 12th and ask that you vote in favour of the Motion at your Council meeting on June 26th. For the sake of our community – do not defer this or ask for yet another staff report.

On May 27, 2012 the Settlers Park Residents Association was officially established specifically to oppose the proposed aerobic pilot project.

The neighborhoods of German Mills and Settlers Park believed that we had fully dealt with this issue six years ago. At that time, we met with then-Councillor Shapero, staff, took tours of other former landfill sites and met with many of the same consultants, engineers and academics as are once again trying to force upon us a project we rejected six years ago.

Sincerely,
Tim

(27)

Hau, Lucy

Subject: FW: Proposed Aerobic Landfill Project and Howard Shore Motion to be heard June 26, 2012

From: Al Dharsee

Sent: June 21, 2012 10:56 PM

To: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Burke, Valerie; Li, Joe; Chiu, Alex; Ho, Alan; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Kanapathi, Logan

Cc: Shore, Howard; Clerks Public

Subject: Proposed Aerobic Landfill Project and Howard Shore Motion to be heard June 26, 2012

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

I fully support Councillor Howard Shore's Motion to completely remove consideration of an Aerobic Treatment System for the former Sabiston Landfill in Thornhill now known as German Mills Settlers Park. This former landfill has been closed for over 37 years and has undergone natural remediation since then. The City's sampling data disclosed by Howard Shore indicates that there is almost zero methane being generated and mostly oxygen in the areas bordering the homes surrounding the former landfill. The methane burner located in the field next to Cottonwood has nothing to burn but oxygen !

For the City to now spend over \$500,000 for a test site to bring the methane levels from zero to zero is, in my opinion, a total waste of taxpayers money and will do nothing for scientific research of the aerobic method as there is zero to insignificant methane being generated to start with. This project will just make Markham look like fools with a lot of money to burn.

Yours truly
Al Dharsee