

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF
MILTON AREA CITIZENS COALITION
HALTON FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE
WATKIN AND DOREEN MARTIN
MICHAEL AND CINDY REED
WALTER AND AMELIA TOMOSKY
THOMAS AND MARY JEAN MARTIN

The Joint Board is requested to dispose of the applications before it in accordance with the following:

1. The Board should accept the Environmental Assessment as amended during the course of this hearing.
2. The Board should grant approval to proceed with the undertaking of landfilling at Site F according to the method proposed by the Region; i.e. the conceptual design presented and defended by Mr. Hiraishi subject to the modifications outlined by Mr. Feenstra. *not a designer. -*
OK for site F, not (d)
3. The Board should refuse to grant approval to proceed with the alternative undertaking of landfilling at Site D for 2 reasons:

(a) the method proposed by the Region; i.e., the conceptual design presented by Mr. Hiraishi, has been repudiated by the Region and the Region has not called engineering evidence to present and defend an alternative conceptual design; and,

(b) in any event, the undertaking is structured in the alternative and it is clear on the evidence that the location preferred by the Region is the preferred one (Site F).

4. The Board should grant all other necessary approvals for Site F, except a Certificate of Approval under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act.

5. The Board should direct the Director of Approvals to issue a Certificate of Approval under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act, subject to the submission to the Director of satisfactory final plans and specifications in accordance with the conceptual design presented to the Board.

6. The Board should refuse to grant all other approvals that are before it relating to Site D.

7. In the event that the Board concludes that Site F cannot be used for landfilling and that it is necessary to use Site D, it is submitted that the Board should:

(a) accept the Environmental Assessment as amended during the course of this hearing;

(b) defer the approval to proceed with the undertaking of landfilling at Site D to itself to be heard and determined

at a time when the proponent has prepared engineering evidence to present and defend a conceptual design for Site D.

(c) (i) defer the consideration of the Region's application for a Certificate of Approval under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act to itself to be heard at the same time as item (b); or,

(ii) in the alternative, if no deferral of item (b) is considered necessary, defer the consideration of the Region's application for a Certificate of Approval under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act to the Environmental Assessment Board for a hearing under section 30 of the Environmental Protection Act on the suitability of any subsequent conceptual design for Site D, once the proponent has prepared engineering evidence to present and defend a conceptual design for Site D; and,

(d) impose as a condition of approval under the Environmental Assessment Act, if approval is to be given, the proposed condition relating to properties in proximity to Site D.