

We don't need to take risks to be waste-diversion leader

Thu Mar 20, 2008

To the editor:

I was initially pro-incineration some time ago. It sounds like a great idea. Why not get rid of your garbage on a small site and produce some usable electricity and heat in the process. The only problem is that this rosy portrayal is delusional. Burning garbage does not get rid of the problem of waste and is in fact more wasteful than using those materials for other purposes.

Incinerators will aggravate our own demise by creating more greenhouse gases and potentially lethal health effects that could very well be grounds for a lawsuit in the future against the Region. This will cost us millions more than the hundreds of millions of dollars that it will cost to build the facility. These cost projections do not include the cogeneration capability (aka. running a pipe under our region to provide district heating) that is touted as being the only way to make an incinerator efficient enough to be financially viable.

Regional Chairman Roger Anderson is the main proponent of incineration: He said, "If it's good enough for us to send our garbage to the U.S. or if it's good enough for us to send it to Peterborough, then it's good enough for the City of Toronto to send their garbage here."

Then he says, "Durham should be responsible for Durham's garbage and we should tell our neighbours to keep their garbage the hell out." York is 12 per cent part of this incineration project. One last statement by Mr. Anderson speaks for itself, "Just because it's got the recyclable thing on it, don't believe it . . . I can collect everything you want. Throw it all in the blue box but then, I'm going to put it in a garbage truck and burn it or bury it."

Durham is widely known and used as a case study around the world for our high diversion rate and exceptional waste policy. We don't need to take any "risks" to be a leader in waste policy Mr. Anderson.

Kevin LeGrand

Oshawa
