As an individual renting a house nearby the proposed sewage waste site, I am appalled at this proposal. And as a University graduate in biology, I am astounded. For so many reasons this should not even be at this point of talk, as it should have been rejected long ago.

Throughout this paper I will be referring to the approval requirements in the proposal and the *Provincial Policy Statement, 2020* that is found at Ontario.ca. Statements that are contradicted will be followed by the statement number in brackets.

During my time at University I have learned about, and as a renter I am concerned about:

1. **Runoff.** There are two creeks flowing through the property where runoff would easily flow into and contaminate the waterways (2.2.1.b). Not only that, but it lies on a floodplain. The contaminated water would flow to other properties and into well water that numerous people use everyday (2.2.1.f). The approval requirements state that:

*“No hauled sewage shall be spread at the site under conditions where hauled sewage may run off or discharge from the site”.*

Clearly sewage will run off and discharge from the site, and therefore this proposal should be nixed.

1. **Land and Waste Pollution.** In this century, garbage elimination should be at the forefront of one’s mind, *not* garbage *production*. In this generation, garbage is already a huge concern as it is killing animals, hurting humans, and in general is just an eye sore. My generation should absolutely NOT have to pick up after someone else to try to fix a problem that should not even be a problem to begin with. This proposal will mean someone spreading garbage directly onto land – tampons, prophylactics, and non-biodegradable items… AND garbage will float down the creek again contaminating everything in its path (1.1.1.c). Disgusting. The approval requirements state that:

*“Spills of a pollutant that cause or may cause an adverse effect are to be reported to the Ministry’s Spills Action Centre and the company shall take appropriate remedial action”*

Clearly the process of even applying the untreated waste, plastics, and garbage would be considered a “spill” and a “pollutant”.

Based on the provincial policy statement of the Ministry of the Environment Conservation and Parks, under the definition of adverse effects (a-g):

1. there will be an impairment of the quality of the natural environment
2. there will be injury or damage to property, plant, or animal life

c), d), e) there will be harm, material discomfort, and negative mental and physical health effects on any person

f) there will be adverse livestock effects on adjacent properties

g) there will be a loss of enjoyment of normal use of property (I will no longer be able to go for my daily walks in the fields).

Please read the *Provincial Policy Statement, 2020* at Ontario.ca which cannot be fulfilled by this proposal. From all these points and more, this proposal should be nixed.

1. **Floodplains.** As mentioned earlier, the land is on a floodplain. The approval requirements state that:

*“The operator shall identify setbacks from sensitive features...”*

You know as well as I do that a floodplain is a sensitive feature and MUST be dealt with correctly, so as not to contaminate the watershed and the environment (1.1.1.c, 1.1.4.1.h, **1.2.6.1**, 2.2.1.b, 2.2.1.f.) A heavy downpour will surely cause runoff. If not dealt with now, my generation will suffer from the environmental issues caused by putting the untreated waste on a floodplain. We should NOT have to pay for this mess later. It will be more costly for my generation and the next generation both financially AND environmentally. That is unfair, and therefore this proposal should be nixed.

1. **Stench, Vermin, and Litter.** The approval requirements state that:

*“The company must ensure no unnecessary off-site effects such as vermin, vectors, odour, dust, litter, noise or traffic, result from the operation of this site.”*

As a renter around this area, I would be always be smelling the ripe odour of this disgusting operation (1.2.6.1). That is not fair to me or the people around me who want to enjoy being outdoors. What about me or others enjoying the environment at and around our properties? How does this protect our enjoyment of the environment? I do NOT want to avoid being outside or closing my windows. That is not a life that I think would be enjoyable. Also, think about the smells attracting animals. I do not want vermin around my property causing problems or being a nuisance (1.1.1.c) Again, as mentioned earlier, LITTER will definitely happen. Winds will sweep up the garbage and particulates that are on the property and go into the creeks or onto neighbouring properties. Again, that is unfair to everyone in the area. Therefore, this proposal should be nixed.

1. **Diseases.** Human waste can also contain pathogens (e.g. *E.coli* and *Salmonella*) that could be extremely harmful (University of Rochester Medical Center, 2021). Transmission of these harmful pathogens can occur from wild or domesticated animals picking it up, and water contamination (University of Rochester Medical Center, 2021). This will certainly negatively affect responsible farmers and livestock health (1.1.1.c, 2.2.1.b, 2.2.1.f) . Again, this proposal should be nixed.

If you want to consider everyone’s stance and if you care about our livelihoods, consider doing these:

* First, the cost of getting a septic tank pumped out should *include* the cost of the proper treatment of the sewage. The septic tank owner should cover the cost of proper treatment of septage and not circumvent *proper* disposal of the waste.
* Then, dispose of the sewage (nay, *pollutant*) at a registered waste treatment plant. Simple solution. This also means less cost later to my generation and to you, so that we do not have to deal with the aftermath.
* And/or, convert the waste to something that is useful (biogas/digester gas application) such as electricity, heat, etc. If it were just to sit on a field it would accomplish nothing.

To top it all off, on the basis of an ESG (Environmental Social Governance) of this proposal, one would *not* invest in it based on sustainability, environmental impact, *ethical* impact, and the self-governing nature/structure. It is a pointless proposal that does not benefit *anyone* except for The Stool Bus. While they benefit financially, we are burdened with everything I have already listed.

*This burden should not be something that we as Canadians who love this land and care about equality should worry about. Hauled untreated waste disposal sites are BANNED in other provinces. It should be banned in Ontario also!*

As you are an environmental agency, you know that what I have listed is true. You also know that someone at some point will have to be held accountable for this ill-conceived proposal if it passes. Someone would also have to govern disputes (odour, debris), inevitable pollution, and clean-up. That is a lot of work over something that has no point. Put yourself in my shoes, and my neighbours. Would you want to live near this site for the next 20 years, deal with the stench, garbage, and run-off… or let your children deal with the headaches when they grow up? You would not want to. If you put this proposal through, you would be destroying the enjoyment of the environment in this neighbourhood. You know the right answer to this ridiculous proposal.

I do appreciate your time and consideration in thinking this through, and I know that you *will* make the right decision.
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