

Let's not become recipient of other municipalities' garbage

Tue Apr 15, 2008

To the editor:

The view of Durham Region's chairman, Roger Anderson, on incineration, burns me almost as much as his \$168,000 salary, for an unelected position.

I, like many others, have many concerns regarding this proposed Overgrown Burn Barrel (not Energy From Waste facility) not the least of which is, I don't want to see us burning other municipalities' garbage to generate revenue. Plans call for 140,000 tonnes per year, of which Durham would commit 100,000 tonnes and York 20,000 tonnes. Last year Durham generated 116,285 tonnes of garbage, with a diversion rate of 53 per cent. The Region's diversion rate target for 2010, only two short years away, is 70 per cent. Using 2008 figures, if 116,285 tonnes equals 47 per cent of our waste, one per cent equals 2,474 tonnes, and 30 per cent in 2010 (that portion not diverted) equals 74,224 tonnes of garbage. This would leave them with a shortfall of 25,000 tonnes that Durham is committed to, plus 10,000 tonnes -- half the excess capacity of 20,000 tonnes -- to be shared equally by Durham and York, for a total shortfall of 35,000 tonnes. Now if this O.B.B is to run "efficiently" it's going to need a steady stream of garbage, so how long will it be before it's proposed that we import someone else's garbage, for a nominal fee? Strictly in the name of efficiency, of course. This shortfall can't be made up by a population increase, due to growth, because the population of Durham would have to increase by 50 per cent in two years to make up the shortfall.

Rob MacDonald

Newtonville