
Appendix 3

Comment/Response Tables

Table 1 -Response to Comments Resulting From the May 9th, 10th, and 11th, 2006 Public Information Sessions on the Evaluation of “Alternatives To” and Consultants Conclusion on the Preferred System



TABLE 1

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RESULTING FROM THE MAY 9, 10, 11TH, 2006 PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSIONS
ON THE EVALUATION OF “ALTERNATIVES TO” AND CONSULTANTS CONCLUSION ON THE PREFERRED SYSTEM**

COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>At the end of some comments an <i>italicized</i> number is present in brackets. This indicates the frequency, or how many times a particular comment was mentioned</p>	
<p><i>Comments on Alternative Systems</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think from tonight’s information session I prefer option 2b because of not burning plastics – very concerned about possible carcinogens – I am a breast cancer survivor with a 25% chance of recurrence and I don’t want the air I breathe to increase that per cent chance of recurrence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the comparative evaluation process it was concluded that <i>System 2(a) - Thermal Treatment of Mixed Solid Waste and Recovery of Energy followed by Recovery of Materials from Ash/Char</i> - is the system that offers the preferred balance of advantages and disadvantages given the environmental priorities established by the study area communities and the Joint Waste Management Group. In reaching this conclusion, it was recognized that new technologies categorized in System 2(b) – Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel may ultimately offer important benefits. It is being recommended that, the competitive process used during the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” allow for the submission of proposals to implement both System 2(a) and System 2(b), and that the final decision on the technologies used to implement the preferred residuals processing system be based on the results of this competitive process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology is available. Landfill will put out CO₂/CH₄ over time much as with incineration. Safe and best technology is 2a. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2a is the most viable alternative presented. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My vote is for 2b, I like that you have kept this option open. Site: we do have 2 nuclear sites. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration fro 2c if disposal of ash/char a more difficult proposition over a straight landfill – 2b significantly greater percentage of ash/char given total residuals to water & air is higher without much benefit to energy producer and less recyclables obtained 	



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only sensible answer is to put residual waste through the very high temperature “Plasma Gasification” process. This process could look after “sewage sludge”, hospital waste and sludge from processing recycled paper products. I appreciate the planning of York and Durham regions, but for the sake of economy, since most of the alternatives are costly, a much larger portion of southern Ontario should have been included in the study. A strong suggestion is to look at the Wesleyville site as an opportunity to accommodate York, Durham, Peterborough, Northumberland and Kawartha lakes. This site is owned by Ontario Power Generation, but has not been used for 30 years. 600-800 million dollars were spent and we the citizens of Ontario are paying for it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Wesleyville site falls outside of the municipal boundaries of the Regions of Durham and York. During the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”, as set out in Section 6.2 of the approved EA Terms of Reference, Step 6 <i>“Prospective vendors of the technology(ies) will be requested to submit their qualifications and may be invited to submit their own alternative site(s) for consideration. Prospective vendor site(s), if submitted, must clear minimum compliance requirements, such as being located in Ontario, to be included on the short list of sites. Public and agency consultation will be undertaken when the short list of alternative sites has been finalized.”</i> Therefore, should OPG wish to have the Wesleyville site included for consideration as a potential short listed site, the EA Terms of Reference does allow for this option.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thermal appears to be a viable option, however we need to be sure that we can live with it. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EFW technology is long overdue as a solid waste management option. 	
<p>Comments on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)</p>	
<p>There were a number of comments regarding product stewardship and consumer responsibility:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAW E.P.R Committee is opposed to the burning of waste. We believe it will retard the movement to regulate and legislate industry to take responsibility to manage their products end of life. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass burn incineration will reduce the commitment to recycle and reduce imports, i.e., it will create a demand for garbage to burn in order to keep the incinerator operating efficiently. This Study must be able to ensure that waste reduction and recycling remains the highest priority. This commitment will necessitate new ways of collecting and handling waste at-source, e.g., household hazardous waste collection, multi-unit residential waste handling system, etc. • I would like to see the liquor stores taking back bottles they sell. Why is this possible in other provinces and countries and not in Ontario? • Energy and time should also be put into convincing industries to reduce excess packaging of goods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” (Annex C-1) including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. This included review of the role of Extended Producer Responsibility in Ontario (for example the Blue Box Program developed by the WDO that involves funding from industry to support recycling of packaging materials) and in other jurisdictions such as Europe. • No comparable municipality in North America has achieved a diversion rate much beyond 50 percent. Some jurisdictions in Europe have achieved higher diversion rates and the majority of these also use thermal treatment to dispose of the residues that remain after diversion. • The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion. • Durham and York will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need more producer responsibility/first importer responsibility. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your Study of reducing landfill and more diversion (recycling) did you consider the possibility of more and more packaging by manufacturers affecting the % of diversion? Are we doing a good job of reaching packaging companies and the buying public, i.e., don't package your goods in such a high waste method and don't buy over packaged goods. Overall, I support the Study and it's recommendations. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass legislation requiring packagers to assume some of the cost of recycling (3). 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel that our governments need to put more pressure on manufacturers to package materials in recyclable products. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see diversion rate maximized so that the amount of waste to be treated is as small as possible. I realize that this will only happen if there is a concerned government effort and regulations to modify packaging. 	



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<i>Comments on Waste Reduction</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipalities should make it easier for residents to recycle at the curb, at work, at malls, and in apartments/condos. • Before we start burning garbage, I would like to say that it is a shame that a lot of high rises and condominium complexes still do not do anything to recycle their waste. As well as the corporate sector in Ontario needs to be forced to take action. The status now is unacceptable and not fair to the homeowners. • Something should be done to outlaw plastic bags. Why can garbage not be put out in easily disposable paper bags and charge for more than 1 bag? • We live in a small condo building and currently have 2 large blue bins with weekly truck pick-up. I have noticed shredded paper thrown in. This can't be hand sorted out! Now, small notices say: throw shredded paper in garden waste bags to decompose. Please improve on this, as these bags go out for garden waste <u>part</u> of the year. Talk about the <u>whole year</u> solution please. I personally have put my shredded paper in paper bags, sealed, dropped in blue bins and writing on outside of bag for sorter. • Need to redesign the Blue Box with a multi-compartment box that is colour coded to facilitate the separation of recyclables. Need more information in public space as to what can be recycled. Need enhanced education beginning with schools, etc. Need to make fast food facilities responsible for waste created. • Enforce Blue and Green Box recycling evenly over both Durham & York regions as well as their municipalities to further maximizes pre treatment recoveries making the 2c system redundant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future. • Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. This included the role of waste reduction and the need for expansion of the municipal diversion programs in Durham and York. • The Regions of Durham and York currently operate integrated waste management systems that include a number of waste diversion programs intended to reduce the quantity of residential waste being sent for disposal and have plans to implement a variety of additional diversion measures and incentives to achieve higher at-source diversion rates. This is documented in the “Additional At-Source Diversion” report included as Annex C-1. • No comparable municipality in North America has achieved a diversion rate much beyond 50 percent. Some jurisdictions in Europe have achieved higher diversion rates and the majority of these also use thermal treatment to dispose of the residues that remain after diversion.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Region (Durham) should continue to implement programs to increase recovery rates and encourage as much diversion as possible, through the 3Rs from the waste stream. Discontinue the use of opaque green or black plastic garbage bags as this allows people to hide the fact that they are not recycling any materials. If waste were put loose in totes then the garbage collectors would readily know where is not following waste separation or recycling practices. In terms of whose responsibility waste disposal and alternative systems development belongs to, it must be brought to the attention of the taxpayers and not left to the politicians or bureaucrats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion.
<i>Comments on Health Risks and Air Emissions</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would really like to know locations considered for these waste management facilities and what the health cost associated with each type of facility would be. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thermal Treatment plants for municipal solid waste are operated safely around the world, including in Europe, the United States and right here in Brampton. These facilities have stringent monitoring programs in place to ensure the safety and protection of humans and the natural environment. In 1999, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) released a study assessing the risks associated with incineration to human and ecological health. In this study, the MOE concluded that no significant health effects are likely in a typical suburban community located near an incinerator. They also predicted that water and sediment quality near an incinerator would meet ministry guidelines for protection of aquatic life.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm concerned about the pollution that would result from an incinerating plant and I believe the public would be too. If York Region wishes to pursue the incinerating plant, they need to ensure the public that there will not be risks, or at least, the risks will be minimal. I am, however, open to the possibility of an alternative waste management method if the environmental risks are extremely minimal. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The resulting air quality. Maybe another comparison with emissions from this type of facility against the amount of trucks and resulting greenhouse gas from their emissions. 	



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears that thermal facilities are simply a volume reduction process with a potential to affect the environment (air), which cannot be controlled if an unacceptable release occurs or if future air quality is deemed to be unacceptable. Landfill permits contingencies if water or soil is impacted. My main concern is that with exhaust that meets MOE regulations, there is still loading to the air. This is compounding the asthma and other air-related problems we are having now. Very concerned about high air emissions from alternative 2(a). If alternative 2(a) is chosen, what can be done to drastically reduce its air emissions? 	<p>meet ministry guidelines for protection of aquatic life. Since the release of this document, even more stringent air emissions regulations have been released and enforced by the Province, further reducing the potential impacts related to the types of facilities studied in 1999.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the approval of Thermal Treatment as the preferred “Alternative to” by Regional Councils, a comprehensive review of the potential human and ecological impacts of Thermal Treatment, specific to the Durham/York Study area would be undertaken as part of the siting process. Input received from the analysis of the potential for human and ecological health impacts will represent an important component of the siting of a long-term waste processing facility(ies).
<i>Comments on Incineration</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I’m still not convinced thermal treatment will not negatively affect the increased recycling efforts. Lazy humans will reduce or eliminate their recycling efforts if they know the material would be burned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future. Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” including consideration of what is being achieved worldwide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though I agree with providing a thermal facility, I would encourage these facilities only process material, which should have been thoroughly sorted by citizens before it, leaves their homes. To break open garbage bags, which includes materials, which should have been separated by the homeowner, or a commercial establishment is an irresponsible action. No recyclable materials should go to the thermal facilities. Do not consider allowing a single pound of material, which should be diverted to recycling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a thermal treatment facility with capacity for the approximately 250,000 tonnes of residual waste projected for Durham and York began operating in 2011 and continued to operate at that capacity through to the end of the study planning period in 2045, then increased diversion will be required to offset population growth. By 2045 an overall diversion rate in excess of 75% would be required in order for the facility to continue to address the study area residual waste management needs. • Thermal facilities are not a barrier to diversion when they are sized and operated appropriately. For example, the Region of Peel has achieved very high diversion rates and thermally processes most of its residual wastes. In practice, it is generally jurisdictions with high cost disposal facilities such as thermal facilities that have high diversion rates while jurisdictions with abundant low-cost landfill disposal facilities generally have lower diversion rates.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons against incinerators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More greenhouse gas ▪ Asthma in children ▪ Will be burning toxins ▪ Will burn recyclables to keep production of energy ▪ Still need to landfill toxic substances after incineration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions were one of many factors assessed in the evaluation of the alternative systems. While the systems that included a Thermal Treatment component did emit more GHG, for other aspects of the environment, such as emissions to water, potential impacts to land, potential social/cultural impacts etc. System 2a) followed by 2b) were found to have a lower overall potential impact to the environment.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thermal Treatment plants for municipal solid waste are operated safely around the world, including in Europe, the United States and right here in Brampton. These facilities have stringent monitoring programs in place to ensure the safety and protection of humans and the natural environment. In 1999, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) released a study assessing the risks associated with incineration to human and ecological health. In this study, the MOE concluded that no significant health effects are likely in a typical suburban community located near an incinerator. • The residual waste stream that would be managed by the preferred system would not be classified as toxic or hazardous. Contaminants of concern would be captured in the air pollution control system and would be managed at an approved landfill facility.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of ash as an aggregate or stabilization simply delays and/or disperses the ash chemicals release to the environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the purpose of evaluating systems, it was assumed that all Air Pollution Control system residues (fly ash) would be handled and managed as hazardous waste, either through landfill at a hazardous waste management facility or stabilization prior to landfill in a conventional landfill, and that all bottom ash would be landfilled within a conventional landfill. It was recognized in the evaluation of systems (see Table ES-2 in the Report on the Identification of the Preferred Residuals Processing System) that the heavy metals present in the ash from thermal treatment, are present in the residual waste, and therefore with all of the systems that were compared



COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>these metals will end up in landfill. Studies on landfills in the U.S. indicate that there is very little potential for the movement of metals out of landfill. In regards to use of ash as a aggregate, studies in Europe indicate that following a ‘curing period’ the metals within bottom ash can become chemically bound, and it is considered to be a safe and viable practice to use this material as a substitute for aggregate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All waste should be dealt with, where it originates, Durham and York Regions should be required to deal with waste the most effective way. Incineration with power generation, as presently done in most cities half the size of Toronto, is the preferred method of dealing with waste in European cities. I consider incineration the best method of dealing with waste locally, provided the impact on air and water are top priorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regions of Durham and York are seeking to find a ‘local’ solution to manage their residual waste so they are not as reliant on export alternatives outside of their respective municipal boundaries.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incineration/Thermal Treatment of refuse has been done successfully in Europe (400+ million inhabitants, first world standards) and Japan (120 million inhabitants, first world nation). Why are ½ a billion people deemed to be wrong? The “no incineration” policies have been approved for several decades with no valid objections from a technology/engineering/cost point of view. So why are we still staying away from this approach? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We hope the process will be able to be completed, free of political interference. We support a thermal facility in an industrial area and meeting/exceeding standards for emissions, as a solution for our residual waste. This is a valuable proactive initiative from York and Durham Regions – let’s move ahead. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I strongly agree with building a thermal facility to divert waste from landfill. It is also my opinion based on the need for more electricity in the province that this type of process is long overdue and should have been started twenty years ago. The use of landfills is an outdated technology and should be phased out if and when possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incineration with adequate buffering, residents to traffic and emissions is a concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fluidized bed incineration is my preferred method to thermally decompose municipal garbage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What percent of non-ferrous metal is expected to be received? What will be done with the thermal energy? Were the four proposals compared to Brampton's plant, Algonquin Power? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The composition of the residual waste stream anticipated to be managed by the preferred residuals processing system is set out in Annex E-1. The exact composition of the non-ferrous metals (i.e. zinc, copper etc.) has not been established at this time, given the very high degree of variability of many components of the waste stream. A portion of the thermal energy generated by Thermal Treatment in all systems that include this component will be recovered in the form of electrical energy. For the purpose of comparing systems, it was assumed that there would be no recovery of the remaining heat generated by the systems, as this is very dependent on the siting process (i.e. adjacent to a heat/steam user or district heating system). The Algonquin Thermal facility in Brampton is an example of the type of Thermal Treatment that could be implemented as part of Systems 2a), b) and c), and the operational information from this facility was considered during the evaluation process.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incineration appears to be the only option besides recycling to get rid of our garbage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<i>Comments on Public Information Sessions and Communications</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The limited number of people from other cultures leads me to believe advertising efforts were inadequate. An excellent, well prepared presentation delivered by knowledgeable people. Thank you. I will continue to participate. You need to describe the facilities when you speak rather than using numbers e.g., 2a, 2b, etc. If you don't, the presentation is meaningless. Too tough to see writing at the bottom of charts. You did explain them, but once is not enough? So refer to them as thermal, biological, etc. Use a microphone for presentation (2)! Clarify who everyone presenting is (who called the meeting, etc.). I am new to the Township and still don't know who people are even when given their names. Do not use short forms and acronyms in your presentations (2). Define your terms more simply; I am totally unfamiliar with this topic of waste management. Provide the handouts before you do the presentation. Disapprove of the conduct here but you must agree that most of the problems arise from misinformation. No information or misinformed is dangerous as can be seen tonight. Please either print the truth or inform each and every one of us. We agree with the ideals but not with the method. Thank you for the meeting, very informative, leads to more questions, unfortunately maybe too late (Cannington). Found both the Region and the consultants condescending, rude and evasive. Terrible display of unprofessionalism to the citizens of Brock. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments regarding the information sessions, materials and consultative process are being considered during the development of the consultation sessions that will be held to support public review and comment on the EA Study. All current Study documents are available on the Study Website at www.durhamyorkwaste.ca as well as will be made available in hardcopy or CD format by request to the study coordinator at info@durhamyorkwaste.ca.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Space out these Public Information Sessions, some of us work nights and are unable to attend. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to have a better educational component to encourage more recycling. The City could help divert more by providing facilities that stream products for reclaim. People don't know where to take broken items for reclaiming e.g., computers, TV's, radios, etc. This City has been very slow to provide good recycling programs e.g., only recently increased types of materials accepted. Still doesn't accept Styrofoam. There is a lot more to be done than install an incinerator and I am worried that allowing one will take the pressure off to do the rest that is required. There is a need for an increase in awareness to the public. A couple of ways that I would support by increasing awareness and getting the community involved are: (1) A committee to inform communities; (2) Newsletter or section the "Mission Green" paper and (3) Call centre for information. All of which could be implemented by volunteers or Environmental Ambassadors. If there were a possibility for volunteers or community ambassadors to be a part of the awareness process, I would gladly donate my time to inform the community because there is a need for community involvement and awareness. Most people are uninformed or under educated on the subject. If there is anyway that my idea reaches a possibility, please contact me (contact information provided). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review of Additional At-Source Diversion (Annex C-1) of the Report on the Preferred Residuals Processing System, noted the need for extensive public education and promotion to support achievement of the Region's diversion goals. To promote awareness of the Durham York Residual Waste Study, a variety of media and methods are being used. Suggestions for improvements are welcome and will be considered as the Study proceeds.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preferred alternatives are literally rammed down our throats. The presenters talked a mile a minute as if they wanted to win a race. For someone who is vaguely familiar with the presented options, and technically not well based, the pace was much too fast. It was impossible to grasp how the systems will function, and to understand the pros and cons. It would be a good idea if the Region (York) could set up educational seminars or an all-day (weekend) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments regarding the information sessions, materials and consultative process are being considered during the development of the consultation sessions that will be held to support public review and comment on the EA Study. All current Study documents are available on the Study Website at www.durhamyorkwaste.ca as well as



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>affair to give the public a chance at understanding the mechanics, and pros and cons of each alternative. The Terms of Reference were not presented, so the whole affair was not in context. Residual waste should be disposed as close to our backyards as possible, so everybody obtains an idea of the consequences of our wasteful ways. The assumption that only 40% of our current wastes needs to be dealt with by the preferred alternative(s) was “waste reduction” part of the terms of reference. Thanks for not breaking up the assembly after the presentation – the one on one discussion would not have been very informative. This way there was synergy and learning.</p>	<p>will be made available in hardcopy or CD format by request to the study coordinator at info@durhamyorkwaste.ca.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the information. A little knowledge is dangerous. I am not qualified, on the basis of a two-hour briefing, to express an informed opinion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I must congratulate you on avoiding direct questions re: the Brock dump. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent presentation, hopefully the skeptics will be won over. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.
<i>Other Comments</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel this new technology is a win-win strategy where we have growing problems with waste and electricity. I hope we can find this technology in Ontario, not overseas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many more meetings do we have to attend without getting ahead? If, for example, engineers and scientists are not fully convinced that the plasma method is not proven, then invite on e or two firms which claim to have the solution and forget further wasting the time with regions and municipalities that don't want to go ahead with them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Let Toronto and it's municipalities handle their garbage and do not accept their garbage unless it can be handled covering costs and generating a good profit (at least 100% above cost) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of Durham and York in undertaking this EA study is to find a local solution to waste management issues so that they are not as reliant on export alternatives outside their respective municipal boundaries. Over the course of the study, it may be apparent that opportunities exist to provide excess capacity in the early stages of the planning period to neighbouring municipalities provided it would benefit the proponents and the broader environment. Municipal solid waste originating from outside the Study Area, particularly from smaller neighbouring communities outside the Greater Toronto Area, would offer a potential waste stream that could be managed by surplus capacity incorporated into the undertaking, should this be determined to be beneficial.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Siting must be close to major population centres allowing greater efficiencies of trucking and transmission of recovered energies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This comment will be addressed during the Evaluation of Alternative Methods.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can we increase the diversion beyond 75%? If legislation leads to better results, e.g., Sweden, what's the likelihood that Ontario will do the same? In absence of legislation, what strategies at the local level can be adopted to pursue the above goal, e.g., education at different levels? What if, by the stroke of luck, Ontario brings in the legislation or more advances are made otherwise in the next 10-15 years and bingo, we're at 90-95% diversion, are we going to end up with an underutilized facility? Maybe we end up importing garbage from elsewhere to keep the facility going at full capacity OR perhaps we can start looking into the possibility of merging the Agro-facility, so that it can burn garbage as well as Agro-material e.g., corn, etc. It seems the objective of the plant should not be limited to reduce emissions, but also capacity to generate more power (on a consistent basis). If such merging technology is not seen elsewhere as an example, let's be innovative and be the first. I'll be glad to assist by being part of the Think Tank. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future. Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of "Alternatives to" including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. No comparable municipality in North America has achieved a diversion rate much beyond 50 percent. Some jurisdictions in Europe have achieved higher diversion rates and the majority of these also use thermal treatment to dispose of the residues that remain after diversion. The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion. In the case of the information on Swedish diversion rates that was noted, the 90 to 95% diversion rate is the diversion from landfill, and includes the diversion of materials through at-source diversion programs like recycling as well as from thermal treatment of residuals.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have submitted literature to Durham Region Waste Disposal, under the name KRC International. I will be pleased to present a Powerpoint presentation on our equipment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” a formal competitive process will be undertaken to select a vendor of the preferred technology(ies) and communication with vendors will be undertaken as appropriate during this process (including opportunities for presentations).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I feel that if people can control the amount of garbage sent to the landfill site, the problem can be solved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not see how when I help out Miller with garbage and recycling why some households need to put out 14 or so garbage bags. If compost and recycling are used more efficiently, the first stop could be slowed down. Being able to convert garbage into useable energy or resources and reducing the amount of residual left over can provide more space to work with in landfill sites (more useable time, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were these proposals compared to the Los Angeles gated community recently describe as garbage generated self-sufficient? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. No specific information was found in regards to the example noted by the respondent.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the final residue; how much, how toxic, and where does it go? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ‘toxic’ contaminants of concern – generally heavy metals – are in the waste stream to begin with, although some (like Dioxins) can be produced during the



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Waste from a thermal facility needs to be landfilled, although it takes less volume than normal waste. The metals, salts, and other material are the same for both waste streams. Therefore, the potential effects on the environment are similar. Disadvantages for System 1 (bullets 1, 2, and 5) are similar for each option. The weighting system should be reassessed.	<p>combustion process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">In the case of a thermal treatment facility, many of these contaminants are concentrated in the air pollution control (APC) system residue. Because the trace metal contaminants from the waste stream have been concentrated in the APC system residue, this material must be managed appropriately either by disposing of it in a secure landfill or by chemically treating it in a manner to render it safe for disposal in a conventional landfill.In addition, a small quantity is also present in the bottom ash/char generated by the facility. This bottom ash/char is not hazardous, and can be disposed within a conventional landfill.It was recognized in the evaluation of systems (see Table ES-2 in the Report on the Identification of the Preferred Residuals Processing System) that the heavy metals present in the ash from thermal treatment, are present in the residual waste, and therefore with all of the systems that were compared these metals will end up in landfill. However, it is not accurate to assume that the disadvantages for the Systems are similar for each option, as metals are only one parameter considered in the evaluation process.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of applying the criteria and indicators used for system comparison, set out in detail in Appendix 3 of the report on the Preferred Residuals Processing System, clearly indicate that there are different advantages and disadvantages for each of the four systems. The weighting system applied in the evaluation process, was confirmed through consultation earlier in the EA Study process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My impression is that not enough alternative options have been investigated during this process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report on “Formulation of Alternative Residuals Processing Systems” set out in Annex C-2 notes the range of the components and systems that were considered in the development of the alternative systems compared in this EA Study. Consultation during the development of the approved EA Terms of Reference regarding alternative options, and consultation early in the EA Study (held in March 2006) did not identify any additional options for consideration to the components (thermal, mechanical and biological treatment) that were carried forward into system formulation as part of the EA Study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the facility to process the leftover waste is to be built, how will you go about choosing the site and keeping the public involved in the process? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The method used to site the facility(ies) that are part of the preferred system, is set out in the approved EA Terms of Reference along with the consultation process to support siting.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When did Durham and York combine to work on this problem? Why did they combine for this when they didn't for composting and recycling? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York and Durham joined together to undertake the Durham/York Residual Waste Study in early 2005, in order to find a way to manage solid waste remaining after diversion (residual or post-diversion waste). Both Durham and York currently export almost all of their waste to Michigan. This practice is not sustainable over the long-term. Both regions share the common goal of wanting to find a <u>local solution</u> to recover resources, both materials and energy, from their waste and minimize future landfill requirements. A joint solution offers the opportunity for cost sharing and economies of scale. Durham and York have not partnered for composting and recycling programs, as both municipalities will generate sufficient blue box materials and source separated organic materials to achieve good economies of scale without such a partnership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We only learn what we read, why are these decisions not made without the input of the affected area and the Council, i.e., politicians. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Joint Waste Management Group (JWVG), a body composed of elected officials (regional and local municipal) as well as Durham and York residents has been actively involved in making decisions throughout the Study. Through the JWVG, both Durham and York regions are addressing the social, environmental and financial impacts of this Study by way of an Environmental Assessment (EA) under the Provincial EA Act.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re: future techniques, there are always better and newer solutions. Why wait till 2011? Europe and Japan have a lot of experience, so let's use it. Please let the politicians make the decision now and not in 2-4 years. The technique exists and nothing should withhold them anymore. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of new disposal/processing capacity at the scale required for Durham and York, requires approval under the Provincial Environmental Assessment Act, which requires that the municipalities proceed with an environmental assessment study. The proponents are proceeding with this study as expeditiously as possible, while still ensuring all necessary regulatory requirements are addressed and the public, stakeholders and agencies have ample opportunity for involvement in the process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversion focus is on residential only. Found presentation focused on house only: No attention is going towards <i>(comment illegible)</i> Triad, apartments, and shopping centres. The plans for diversion all are to make it easier for those of us who want to divert. For those who feel it is not a necessity, they can still put 100% into green garbage bags. The presentation was completely focused on the burning option for the future. There was <u>no</u> discussion on how we can reduce garbage or interest in our ideas. This was what your advertisement said it would be. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Durham and York's waste stream is predominantly residential in origin, as both municipalities have little control over the management of industrial, commercial and institutional waste, and thus the focus of the EA Study is on residential materials. Diversion initiatives were not included in the materials presented at the public information sessions held in May, as the focus of the EA Study is on managing the residual wastes that remain after diversion. However, diversion programs were discussed with attendees at these sessions and Durham and York staff provided information on their respective diversion programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How viable are the energy markets? How are homes connected to the "grid" i.e., is this only in brand new developments? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The market for electrical energy is very viable, and a reasonable revenue from the sale of this energy to the grid was assumed for all systems. The grid referred to in the Study is the electrical 'grid' operated and maintained across the Province.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I strongly believe we need to develop and operate waste/disposal facilities within our own backyard. If we generate the waste, we need to deal with the ramifications of dealing with that waste. That will encourage individuals to be more responsible re: generation of waste. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Durham and York currently export almost all of their waste to Michigan. This practice is not sustainable over the long-term. Both regions share the common goal of wanting to find a <u>local solution</u> to recover resources, both materials and energy, from their waste and minimize future landfill requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With diversion and minor landfilling, the landfill site becomes an industry, much like presented for the thermal facility. Proper operation of the landfill will also be environmentally wise. Statements at the information session that taxes for landfills will assist the proposal by making it cost effective are unjust. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfill facilities are assumed to continue to play a role for the disposal of certain materials that cannot be otherwise processed or diverted. A landfill only system, whereby a new landfill site capable of managing all waste that remains after at-source diversion would not meet the proposed purpose of the undertaking, and thus will not be considered in this EA Study. Rationale for the exclusion of this option is provided in Annex C-2 of the report on the preferred Residuals Processing System.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No more landfills! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'No' to building a facility in Brock Township. Brock Township should be responsible for its own waste as we have been. Expanding the Brock Dump to accept Durham, York or Toronto's garbage is simply not acceptable. Paving our roads not only puts ourselves, our children, pets, etc. in danger to the constant speed and traffic of garbage, recycling, etc. trucks but <u>who</u> will reimburse us for the loss of property values and <u>who</u> will protect us and our families from contaminated water and air. No dump expansion! No outside garbage! Very disturbing. Brock better not be considered as a landfill site in a crisis as it will not pass the EA now! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Durham/York Residual Waste Study is trying to find an alternative for disposal that recovers energy and materials and minimizes landfill requirements. No municipal landfill would be expanded or established as part of this study. For example, York Region has a contract with a private landfill in Ontario for a certain amount of waste over a longer period of time that could accommodate the residual waste from Thermal Treatment.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although no direct impact on cost for the Region, trucking waste does a lot of damage to highways (see e.g., Highway Research Board (USA) NAS, 1962). This study concludes that 1 truck of 80,000 pounds does as much damage as 9,000-12,000 cars (shows up only much later). In addition, trucking produces a lot of pollution, probably more than thermal treatment of waste. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impacts of trucking waste were addressed in the evaluation process, by assuming a specific distance for the haul of materials within the residuals processing system including the haul of residues that require landfill to a location outside of Durham and York, and including this information in the modeling used to estimate the potential impacts to the air and water environment, total energy consumed by the systems and costs. For the purpose of system comparison, it was assumed that materials hauled outside of Durham and York (such as residues to landfill) would travel a relatively short distance (100km). The impact of waste transportation will be given further consideration as part of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” when there are specific sites identified and therefore specific haul distances can be determined.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be a peer review process for all the alternatives? Do we have to accept views of these consultants as the final wisdom on this key environmental issue? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the evaluation of “Alternatives to” have been distributed in draft form to a team of government review agencies who will also receive information on the final report on the preferred “Alternative to”. This team includes the Ministry of the Environment, which will be responsible for the review of all study documents and eventual approval of the results of the EA Study.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be hazardous waste? Where will it go? • Where will all the residual from the incinerator be landfilled? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the purpose of evaluating systems, it was assumed that all Air Pollution Control system residues (fly ash) would be handled and managed as hazardous waste, either through landfill at a hazardous waste management facility or stabilization prior to landfill in a conventional landfill, and that all bottom ash would be landfilled within a conventional landfill.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am totally opposed to the private ownership operation of any alternative selected. Total control must remain with the people through their elected councilors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No decision has been made regarding the ownership of the facilities required to implement the preferred system. This decision will be made as part of the competitive process used to implement the system as part of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”, which is the next major step in the EA Study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garbage to the US is an embarrassment and a misguided planning. I believe you and the politicians underestimate the public’s capability for re-cycling and a plan for garbage solution that is sensible, sustainable and environmentally friendly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee reduction of imports, especially toxic materials (bulbs, fluorescent bulbs, medical waste, electronics, computers). Eliminate toxic imports to incineration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Durham and York have existing programs to manage residential household hazardous waste, and would continue to provide these programs during the study period to minimize the amount of these materials present in the residual waste stream.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Your proposal is sound, however the concern is what will happen when/if the border closes – what happens before this facility is ready (2)? What is the plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The U.S. Federal government is considering legislation that would give the States the power to decide if they will accept waste from outside the Country. The status of this legislation is unknown. If the border were to close, this would create a situation that this study has not been designed to address.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternate incineration in Wesleyville. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Wesleyville site falls outside of the municipal boundaries of the Regions of Durham and York. At the EA Stage – As stipulated in Section 6.2 of the Approved EA Terms of Reference, Step 6 <i>“Prospective vendors of the technology(ies) comprising the preferred disposal system, will be requested to submit their qualifications and may be invited to submit their own alternative site(s) for consideration. Prospective vendor site(s), if submitted, must clear minimum compliance requirements, such as being located in Ontario, to be included on the short list of sites. Public and Agency consultation will be undertaken when the short list of alternative sites has been finalized.”</i> Therefore, should OPG wish to have the Wesleyville site included for consideration as a potential short listed site, the EA Terms of Reference does allow for this option.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We feel that incinerators, which not only dispose of waste, they generate energy and have their emissions are far lower than government regulations specify. (Algonquin Power Facility, Peel Region). We also think that Plasma Gasification should be looked at as an alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment. All thermal treatment technologies are being considered for energy recovery in this undertaking. Plasma Gasification is being considered as part of thermal group technologies considered in this study.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Region pressuring the government for a change to the regulations re: use of bottom ash as aggregate for road base? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the purpose of this EA Study it was assumed that bottom ash or char from thermal treatment would be disposed in conventional landfill. As the EA Study proceeds, further discussions will occur with the MOE on potential uses of this material.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to move further than the European Directive on Waste and Toxic Reduction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EU Directive on Waste and Toxic Reduction currently goes well beyond the Ontario regulatory environment in encouraging increased diversion and reduction in waste. It is possible that over the planning period, the regulatory environment would change, and this would support the achievement of a higher diversion rate over the planning period.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The time has come for the Regions to change their philosophy on how they view and manage both municipal biosolids and residual garbage. The Regions have to adopt the idea that their waste is a resource. They have the moral responsibility of not only getting rid of the waste but giving something back in the form of energy. This energy from waste approach will help limit the burden on the tax-payer and also continue toward the Kyoto accord. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipalities and regions should be responsible for their own waste, not dump it elsewhere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If something is so uneconomical to recycle (yet deemed necessary by the manufacturer) then send it back to the manufacturer at their expense. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.



COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">I would have liked some clearer information about who would own/operate/profit from the proposed facility and how the financial side would work. There was a brief discussion of this aspect, but it was not clear how this was going to work. I would think the best plan would be to have the facility paid and owned by taxpayers, not paid for by taxpayers and owned privately, which seemed to be the direction we were heading. If we build this facility and incur a large cost for a very necessary function, I think it is only fair and sensible that we reap the return on our investment down the road when the facility products (biogas, reclaimed materials etc.) produce revenue, which then comes back into taxpayers' pockets either as a rebate if the facility generates large income, or, more probably, simply as help in offsetting the costs of running the facility. To me, that helps consumer see the choices they have, helps people understand the effect that they can have on the amount of garbage that needs to be processed, and very literally helps them "take ownership" of the problem. The rewards are not immediate, but they are more tangible when they do show up, instead of feeling that a private company is making money off a taxpayer funded project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No decision has been made regarding the ownership of the facilities required to implement the preferred system. This decision will be made as part of the competitive process used to implement the system as part of the evaluation of "Alternative Methods", which is the next major step in the EA Study.

**Table 2 -Response to May 17th, 2006 – Durham Region
Public Delegations on the Evaluation of
“Alternatives To” and Consultants Conclusion on
the Preferred System**



TABLE 2
RESPONSE TO MAY 17, 2006 – DURHAM REGION DELEGATIONS

ON THE EVALUATION OF “ALTERNATIVES TO” AND CONSULTANTS CONCLUSION ON THE PREFERRED SYSTEM

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
Sherry Brown <i>Ajax Citizens for the Environment, Ajax</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Believes that there is insufficient waste to provide consistent electrical energy generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">As part of this Study, facilities operating in North America and Europe have been reviewed. These facilities, operating on similar waste compositions and waste quantities have been found to be able to provide consistent electrical energy generation. Please refer to Annex E-3 of the report on the “Evaluation of ‘Alternatives to’ and Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System” for a detailed Electrical Energy Balance analysis.



Comments and Responses
Annex F - Results of Public and Agency Consultation on Step 7
Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System.

Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes any type of incineration because these materials should be recycled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future. Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” (Annex C-1) including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. This included review of the role of Extended Producer Responsibility in Ontario (for example the Blue Box Program developed by the WDO that involves funding from industry to support recycling of packaging materials) and in other jurisdictions such as Europe. No comparable municipality in North America has achieved a diversion rate much beyond 50 percent. Some jurisdictions in Europe have achieved higher diversion rates and the majority of these also use thermal treatment to dispose of the residues that remain after diversion. The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion.



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution control systems cannot capture all of the toxins • What's left in residue waste is "toxic" and toxic ash needs to be landfilled after incineration • Ash leftover from incineration is more "concentrated" and more "toxic" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the current Ontario Regulations, and the operating performance data obtained on a number of similar facilities, it was assumed that all Air Pollution Control system residues (fly ash) would be handled and managed as hazardous waste, either through landfill at a hazardous waste management facility or stabilization prior to landfill in a conventional landfill, and that all bottom ash would be landfilled within a conventional landfill. • It is important to note that Thermal facilities do not generate toxic waste, the toxic components are already found within the waste stream. Thermal facilities have the ability to capture these "toxic" materials and manage them accordingly. Alternatively, and what is happening today, is these materials are being landfilled alongside all other post-diversion residual wastes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User pay system for waste generators – use clear garbage bags • Advocates: lobbying government to stop excess packaging and to use more recyclable packaging. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being completed to address the future waste management needs of Durham/York and the management of the waste that remains after at-source diversion. Strategies such as municipal at-source diversion programs and government initiatives are outside the scope of this study. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets. • Durham-York will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility.



Comments and Responses
Annex F - Results of Public and Agency Consultation on Step 7
Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System.

Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Landfill residue after diversion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The straight landfilling of unprocessed residual waste was not considered as part of the Durham/York Residual Waste study. Please refer to Section 2.5 of Annex C-2 for the detailed rationale related to the exclusion of a landfill only based disposal alternative.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the future, the government may not support incineration because of GHG emissions, which mean that all the investment in the facility would be wasted money.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being undertaken based on the current regulatory requirements and where possible, consideration is being given to what may happen in the future. Should, in the future, the GHG emissions requirements be changed by the licensing government body, the impact to the facility will be addressed at that time.



Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>John Flewelling <i>Resident of Oshawa</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a Bylaw to the retailer for packaging with non-recyclable content and a tax on excess packaging to annoy retailer and public – Would appear on receipts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being completed to address the future waste management needs of Durham/York and the management of the waste that remains after at-source diversion. Strategies such as municipal at-source diversion programs and government initiatives are outside the scope of this study. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets. • Durham-York will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility.
<p>Peter Gillies <i>Brock & Georgina Against Garbage (B.A.G), Pefferlaw</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe if the border closes, waste from York, Durham and Toronto will go to the Brock Landfill. • Increasing the Brock landfill is an environmental hazard and will increase negative environmental effects. • The Brock landfill leaches into wells, wetlands, ponds, creeks and eventually into our homes and should not be expanded • We advocate safely expediting the approvals process on the basis that there is a garbage crisis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The management of post-diversion residual wastes prior to 2011 is outside the scope of the Durham/York Residual Waste Study. • The straight landfilling of unprocessed residual waste is not being considered as part of this study and does not meet the purpose and need of the undertaking.



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Frits A. Jansen</p> <p><i>Resident of Whitby</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favor of the consultant’s recommendations as it is the only viable way to dispose of the waste. • The timeframe for implementation for 2011 is not acceptable; it should be expedited • Incineration has been used in Europe, Japan and other countries for years with no adverse effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. • In order to address Ontario’s regulatory requirements, this study is being completed as an individual environmental assessment. The proponents are proceeding with this study as expeditiously as possible, while still ensuring all necessary regulatory requirements are addressed and the public, stakeholders and agencies have ample opportunity for involvement in the process. • The types of processes currently being used in Europe, Japan and throughout the world are being investigated and considered by Durham and York as part of this study.
<p>Martha Hamilton</p> <p><i>Resident of Whitby</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocates higher diversion efforts • Industry should be forced to reduce packaging especially non-recyclable plastic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future. • Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” (Annex C-1) including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. This included review of the role of Extended Producer Responsibility in Ontario (for example the Blue Box Program developed by the WDO that involves funding from industry to support recycling of packaging materials) and in other jurisdictions such as Europe. • No comparable municipality in North America has achieved a diversion rate much beyond 50 percent. Some jurisdictions in Europe have achieved higher diversion rates and the majority of these also use



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
		<p>thermal treatment to dispose of the residues that remain after diversion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion. Durham and York will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility.
Joe Mulcahy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of garbage picked up at the curb is plastic, which is needed to produce heat used for incineration. This plastic should be recycled not burned. There is the potential in the future for all plastic to be recycled consequently there would not be enough fuel for incineration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report (Annex C-1) show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion. Given the level of effort and the program changes and policies that will be required to reach this diversion rate as set out in Annex C-1, it is not reasonable to plan for even higher diversion rates. In the Durham York Residual Waste Study the highest priority was placed on the recovery of materials from the waste stream to reach a 60 to 75% diversion target, and the evaluation of systems assumed high recovery rates for materials managed by the municipal blue box program, including the high value plastics in the waste stream. The composition of the residual waste that would be thermally treated in System 2a) (or System 2b) is largely made of materials that cannot be easily recovered by source separated diversion programs or mechanical treatment and that in the most part are difficult to recycle into new materials/products.



Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
Peter Branton <i>Resident of Courtice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes an alternative plan: should build an incinerator with an electric furnace that vaporizes garbage at 2000-3000 degrees and uses multiple scrubbers. The garbage should be mechanically sorted so that recyclable materials are removed prior to incineration. • Plastic bags should be replaced with paper because they are easier to recycle • The region should charge the municipalities for all the garbage they produce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system being referred to is similar to System 2b) and will be considered as part of the Request for Proposals (RFP) stage. • The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being completed to address the future waste management needs of Durham/York and the management of the waste that remains after at-source diversion. Strategies such as municipal at-source diversion programs and government initiatives are outside the scope of this study. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets.
Tom McNeil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the preferred system • The facility should be large enough to take garbage from closed dumps. The facility should be built with the forethought of generating fuel. Both incineration and gasification should be considered and we should not be limited to one type of method. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. • The waste to be managed by the proposed facility(ies) does not currently include waste mined from existing landfill sites. • Systems 2b) and 2c) generate a fuel product to be used in the generation of energy. • Incineration and Gasification are both being considered as part of group of Thermal Treatment technologies considered in this study. The determination of the specific type of Thermal Treatment technology will be made as part of the competitive RFP process.



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Margo McNabb</p> <p><i>Protect the Ridges, Oshawa</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should consider alternate forms of diversion including thermal conversion of organics into biodiesel. • A recovery plant for MDF, flake board and engineered wood to reduce the amount of wood going to landfill • Should encourage households to recycle more used metal wastes • Should train people to work at transfer stations to help people offload and sort their waste 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the Regions of Durham and York, as part of their expanded waste diversion programs, have or will in the near future be, implementing Source Separated Organics programs for the collection of household organic waste. The process to manage this waste once collected is outside the scope of the Durham/York Residual Waste study. • The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being completed to address the future waste management needs of Durham/York and the management of the waste that remains after at-source diversion. Strategies such as municipal at-source diversion programs, reduction initiatives and government initiatives are outside the scope of this study. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets.
<p>Suzanne Elston</p> <p><i>Resident of Clarington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ash from incineration is toxic and needs to be placed in a secure landfill • Scrubbers and filters catch most toxins but then need to be dumped 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on current Ontario Regulations, and the operating performance data obtained on a number of similar facilities, it was assumed that all Air Pollution Control system residues (fly ash) would be handled and managed as hazardous waste, either through landfill at a hazardous waste management facility or stabilization prior to landfill in a conventional landfill, and that all bottom ash would be landfilled within a conventional landfill.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incinerators require huge amounts of garbage to keep them burning hot enough to maintain low emissions – in order to supply incinerators garbage would have to be imported from other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Durham/York facility would be sized to accommodate primarily Durham and York Regions waste. Only those non-GTA municipalities that could provide post-processing residuals landfill disposal



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	districts.	capacity would be permitted to import their waste to a Durham/York facility in exchange for a portion of this landfill capacity.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incinerators require plastic and paper to burn hot enough; materials which are the most easily recycled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponents have investigated the potential for competition between thermal treatment and additional recycling in Europe where both programs are prevalent. In most cases, what has been found is that both recycling and thermal treatment form part of a fully integrated waste management system with some of the highest waste diversion rates in the world.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pollution control systems cannot eliminate dioxin emissions. This makes incineration the largest single source of dioxin emission. Any amount of dioxin no matter how small is toxic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the 1980s significant progress has been made in both the operation of the thermal treatment facilities and air pollution control systems such that the total contribution of dioxins and furans from incineration has been significantly decreased. According to the US EPA MSW incinerators have gone from a major source to a minor one, accounting for 3% of the North American dioxin emissions. Risk from exposure to contaminants in the environment is a function of both the toxicity of the compound and the concentration to which one is exposed. In the case of dioxin, the concentrations emitted will be at a level that the dose to humans and the environment is less than its toxic benchmark, and within acceptable levels.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incinerators have a high capital cost and even with electricity production this does not offset the high capital costs Incineration is not a cheap way to produce electricity; its an expensive way to get rid of garbage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The financial implications of Thermal Treatment have been assessed as part of the evaluation of "Alternatives to". It was found that Thermal Treatment, although currently more expensive than conventional landfill, is comparable in expense when compared to other forms of waste disposal and some forms of waste diversion.



Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should save more power by recycling more • Industry is producing more non-recyclable waste, including single-use products. • If incineration is used then attempts to reduce packaging waste will not be considered • If Edmonton can divert 70% of its waste so can we 	<p>forms of waste diversion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future. • Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” (Annex C-1) including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. This included review of the role of Extended Producer Responsibility in Ontario (for example the Blue Box Program developed by the WDO that involves funding from industry to support recycling of packaging materials) and in other jurisdictions such as Europe. • No comparable municipality in North America has achieved a diversion rate much beyond 50 percent. For example, the City of Edmonton achieved a diversion rate of 44% in 2002 and has remained relatively constant over the past few years. Some jurisdictions in Europe have achieved higher diversion rates and the majority of these also use thermal treatment to dispose of the residues that remain after diversion. • The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion. • Durham and York will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry



Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
		stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incinerators emit more GHG than gas fired power plants and only slightly less than Coal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recent study by Friends of the Earth referred to by Ms. Elston, found that the GHG per Kilowatt hour of power emitted from incinerators that recovered combined heat and power (CHP) was relatively equivalent to that emitted from CHP Gas fired power stations. In the evaluation of alternative residuals processing systems for Durham and York, it was found that System 2a) <i>Thermal Treatment of Mixed Solid Waste and Recovery of Energy followed by Recovery of Materials from Ash/Char</i> would have the highest net life-cycle emissions of GHG, and that System 1 <i>Mechanical and Biological Treatment with Biogas Recovery</i> would have the least. However, it should be noted that for the purpose of evaluating systems it was assumed that with all systems only electrical energy would be recovered. If the recovery of available heat as well as electricity had been factored into the analysis, the thermal treatment systems would have had the lowest life-cycle emissions of GHG.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfills can be mined for resources in the future; resources from incineration are not recoverable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The system that <u>may</u> potentially allow for this type of activity is System #1 which includes the Mechanical and Biological Treatment of waste followed by the landfilling of a stabilized residual. This system was compared against the thermal based alternatives and was found to not be preferred. Please refer to Section 6.0 and 7.0 of the Report on the report on the “Evaluation of ‘Alternatives to’ and Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System”. Systems 2b) and 2c), both thermally based



Comments and Responses
Annex F - Results of Public and Agency Consultation on Step 7
Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System.

Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
		<p>alternatives, were considered as part of the evaluation, and included “front-end” processing components to remove additional resources prior to Thermal Treatment.</p>
<p>Beverley Gibson <i>Resident of Oshawa</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wondered if the green bin program would be expanded to apartments and condominiums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being completed to address the future waste management needs of Durham/York and the management of the waste that remains after at-source diversion. Strategies such as municipal at-source diversion programs, reduction initiatives and government initiatives are outside the scope of this study. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets.
<p>Carroll Nicholls <i>Resident of Port Hope</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plasma gasification technology should be considered, not just incineration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plasma Gasification is being considered as part of group of Thermal Treatment technologies considered in this study. The determination of the specific type of Thermal Treatment technology will be made as part of the competitive RFP process.



Comments and Responses
Annex F - Results of Public and Agency Consultation on Step 7
Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System.

Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
Scott Kennedy <i>Resident of Oshawa</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that Plasma gasification is expensive to start and run; incineration is the only viable option • Should cooperate with Ontario Hydro to sell energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plasma Gasification and Incineration are both being considered as part of group of Thermal Treatment technologies considered in this study. The determination of the specific type of Thermal Treatment technology will be made as part of the competitive RFP process. • The market for electrical energy is very viable, and a reasonable revenue from the sale of this energy to the grid was assumed for all systems. • Each of the alternative systems generates energy which would then have to be sold to the electrical ‘grid’ operated and maintained across the Province. This marketing of energy to the grid would require an agreement with Ontario Hydro.
Andre LeRose <i>Resident of Oshawa</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees with Plasma gasification but has questioned the health implications. • Believes there is no safe level of exposure to carcinogens • Consultants need to look at the total picture not just the plant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact to Human Health will be assessed as part of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” (ie. Siting). During the evaluation of “Alternatives to”, all systems and technologies being considered must be able to “meet or exceed” all regulatory requirements. In Ontario, these regulatory requirements have been established in part to protect public health. • The impact to Human Health will be studied and addressed, both at a generic level initially, and at a site specific level, once the long list of potential sites has been narrowed. This evaluation will take into account potential cumulative impacts of a facility over its operating life-span (35 years).



Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Dave Kearns</p> <p><i>Resident of Oshawa</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies have shown that rates for leukemia and cancer no different in areas within a close proximity of incinerators. • The peel incinerator produces no heavy particulate matter and produces power for several thousand people • Trucking the garbage to Michigan is creating environmental havoc and should be avoided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comments. No response required.
<p>Dave Renaud</p> <p><i>CAW Environment Representative</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes incineration because it retards the movement of EPR (Extended Producer Responsibility) and encourages “out of sight, out of mind” • Believes EPR should be legislated • Producers should be forced to recycle their own goods, including sending tires, appliances and computers back to their manufacturer • Concerned with incineration emissions like dioxin since there is no safe level of exposure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Durham and York are planning on achieving 60% waste diversion by 2011 and may achieve a goal of 75% in the future. • Diversion was studied in detail as part of the consideration of “Alternatives to” (Annex C-1) including consideration of what is being achieved world-wide in the area of diversion and the potential to divert additional materials from the Durham/York waste stream. This included review of the role of Extended Producer Responsibility in Ontario (for example the Blue Box Program developed by the WDO that involves funding from industry to support recycling of packaging materials) and in other jurisdictions such as Europe. • No comparable municipality in North America has achieved a diversion rate much beyond 50 percent. • The proponents have investigated the potential for competition between thermal treatment and additional recycling in Europe where both programs are prevalent. In most cases, what has been found is that both recycling and thermal treatment form part of a fully integrated waste management system with some



Comments and Responses
Annex F - Results of Public and Agency Consultation on Step 7
Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System.

Response to Durham Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 2(cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
		<p>of the highest waste diversion rates in the world.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The detailed projections included in the additional diversion report show what must be achieved in both Regions on a material-by-material basis in order to meet 60% diversion.• Durham and York will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility.• Risk from exposure to contaminants in the environment is a function of both the toxicity of the compound and the concentration to which one is exposed. In the case of dioxin, the concentrations emitted will be at a level that the dose to humans and the environment is less than its toxic benchmark, and within acceptable levels.



Table 3 - Response to May 17th, 2006 – York Region Public Delegations on the Evaluation of “Alternatives To” and Consultants Conclusion on the Preferred System

TABLE 3
RESPONSE TO MAY 17, 2006 – YORK REGION DELEGATIONS

ON THE EVALUATION OF “ALTERNATIVES TO” AND CONSULTANTS CONCLUSION ON THE PREFERRED SYSTEM

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
Peter and Heather Gillies <i>Residents of Brock and Georgina</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.A.G. – Brock and Georgina against Garbage • What will be done with the gap in time till the implementation of this study (between 2006-2011)? • Do not relax environmental regulation. • Do not consider use of Brock landfill site as a contingency measure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The management of post-diversion residual wastes prior to 2011 is outside the scope of the Durham/York Residual Waste Study. • The straight landfilling of unprocessed residual waste is not being considered as part of this study and does not meet the purpose and need of the undertaking.
Ernst von Bezold <i>Resident of Richmond Hill</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to human and environmental health in the composting process. • Cumulative impacts cannot be measured, siting as a way of minimizing cumulative effects. • No landfill means that airshed will receive wastes • A more in depth look at the process needs to be taken. Take public input into account. Are you prepared to pay for this? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed studies related to human and environmental health are more appropriately dealt with as part of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” (ie. facility siting). • As part of the siting process, cumulative effects will be study and taken into consideration. • Both Durham and York have undertaken extensive public consultation which has been incorporated into all documentation to date and will continue this exercise throughout the duration of the EA Study. • The financing and ownership of this facility will be addressed at the competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) stage.



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Gloria Marsh</p> <p><i>York Region Environmental Alliance, Richmond Hill</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultants came up with only one solution with different variations. • Unacceptable incineration will only exacerbate the air quality problems. • Once the incinerator is up and running there will be pressure to keep the ‘monster’ fed undermining waste reduction. • Need creative problem solving • Need for an increase in waste diversion. • Greenhouse gasses are just as harmful as smoking. • Alternative packaging and alternatives to plastic – hemp/fibre. • Need a more streamlined EA process. • “Stop the Rush to Burn” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The four alternative residuals processing systems compared in this study, were based on the combination of mechanical, biological and thermal treatment methods. All four systems can reduce the total volume of waste disposed in landfill, and all have varying rates of material and energy recovery that result in specific differences in the potential environmental impacts associated with the systems. • The impact to air quality has been considered during the evaluation of “Alternatives to”. This will be studied in even more detail during the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” (ie. siting). • The proponents have investigated the potential for competition between thermal treatment and additional recycling in Europe where both programs are prevalent. In most cases, what has been found is that both recycling and thermal treatment form part of a fully integrated waste management system with some of the highest waste diversion rates in the world. • Durham and York Regions will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility to reduce the quantity of waste requiring management. • The aggressive waste diversion targets established in this study are based on a detailed analysis of waste composition and the implementation of full blue box and green bin programs. The key to successful waste diversion will be to get all residents to participate and to participate effectively.
	<p>2</p>	



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
Frank Condlin <i>Resident of Aurora</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology vendor promoting “Controlled Waste Collection” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information Received, no response required at this time.
Fred Jesty <i>Resident of King City</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “Voluntary Efforts” of homeowners will not be enough to achieve significant diversion rates when apartment buildings, shopping malls and business offices are not inclined to join as well. When the program is simply voluntary those that do participate feel good about what they do but wonder if it even makes a difference especially when they read in the newspaper about municipalities that do not have the program to properly handle the blue box contents. Example: Shredded paper. How many other item to residents handle special only to find out it is handled again and sent to Michigan. The maximum garbage bag rule is too easy to violate. In our neighborhood we always have someone on vacation for the extras or what the heck the garbage man will take them anyway. The current every second week blue box pickup is not enough. As pickup approaches and the box is overflowing the green garbage bag quickly becomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional diversion strategies are part of the overall waste management plan for both Regions’, which includes full-scale Green Bin programs Region-wide. These types of programs and a greater level of public participation will be required in order to achieve the waste diversion targets which have been set as part of this study, however, the means to achieve these targets is outside the scope of this EA. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration and response in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets.



Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	<p>an easy alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• References Prince Edward Island as an example• See through bags allow collectors to see if recyclables are thrown out. If so a bright orange sticker is placed on the bag and it is left at the curb.• When starting, this program was not popular with the residents. Change is always difficult to introduce. Having your garbage rejected is frustrating as well as having to do some basic research on how to correct the problem for next week. But one gets a feeling of success when on garbage day you look out and see that your properly sorted bags are taken away and not rejected.	



Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Jan d'Ailly <i>Organic Energy, Waterloo</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology vendor promoting (the integration of waste and energy) or (waste incineration as a renewable source of energy) • Wanted to ensure that the Regions not restrict themselves to one large facility but rather consider the opportunity for more than one smaller facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information Received, no response required at this time. • For comparative purposes it was necessary to assume a consistent number of sites for each of the alternative systems. The rationale for this assumption is included in Annex C-2, Section 5.2.2. The 'single facility, single site' system configuration represents the most efficient system configuration and would provide the economies of scale that are being sought in the Durham/York study. In general, a 'single facility, single site' configuration also represents the configuration which would be expected to have a lower potential for environmental and social impacts, as the total land area required and number of potential receptors that could be impacted by the systems, increases as the number of sites required for each system increases. • Based on facilities currently operating in Europe, it is likely that most of the technologies to be considered at the RFP stage will be larger facilities on a single site. However, the determination to site one facility on one site has not yet been made and will not be made until after the RFP stage in the process.
<p>John Hopkins <i>Resident of Toronto</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information on Vienna Energy-from-Waste (EFW) facility. • Vienna EFW plant has a central location near subway and supplies heat to a nearby hospital. Architectural design has made the facility a landmark. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information Received. • This facility will be investigated as part of the ongoing investigation of European Facilities.



Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Mary Ann Colin</p> <p><i>Resident of Richmond Hill</i></p> <p>(provided 2 delegations, one at 9am the other at 7pm)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in favor of thermal treatment. Dioxin emission from incineration is hazardous to the health of children. • Politicians should make the manufacturers of packaging responsible for reducing their packaging and for collecting and recycling the remainder. • Incineration just creates another form of pollution and it is better to stay with the current method of landfill and reduce the waste produced by recycling. • Band Wagon – there is money to be made by the private sector on establishing and operating new facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact to Human Health will be assessed as part of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” (ie. Siting). During the evaluation of “Alternatives to”, all systems and technologies being considered must be able to “meet or exceed” all regulatory requirements. In Ontario, these regulatory requirements have been established in part to protect public health. • Durham and York Regions will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility to reduce the quantity of waste requiring management. • The financing and ownership of this facility will be addressed at the competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) stage.



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Solveig Vohl</p> <p><i>Resident</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not “Where will your garbage go?” but “How can garbage be AVOIDED in the first place?” • Should tax packaging materials, resulting in cost effective and environmentally friendly packaging for companies and their products. • Unnecessary packaging (I.e. box around something that is already in a tube should be taken back by the manufacturer and reused • Items that should recycled end up in landfills. This is due to being exposed to the elements (blown by wind, dropped by the collection staff) and end up on roads and sidewalks. Then residents pick it up and place in garbage instead of recycling. • Household hazardous wastes should be picked up on a regular basis instead of residents taking it to a depot. • The Government has to lead people into a new “economical environmental” way of thinking and to reduce garbage it has to make it doable for them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being completed to address the future waste management needs of Durham/York and the management of the waste that remains after at-source diversion. Strategies such as municipal at-source diversion programs and government initiatives are outside the scope of this study. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets. • Durham and York Regions will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility to reduce the quantity of waste requiring management.



Comments and Responses
Annex F - Results of Public and Agency Consultation on Step 7
Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System.

Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Jason Balsdon</p> <p><i>Resident of Newmarket</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern 1 – Alternatives are not treatment alternatives but simply provide a reduction in residual waste volume. Metals and salts will affect surface and ground water the same in each alternative. Organics could be removed with an anaerobic system. • Solution to Concern 1 – The comparison of alternatives for emissions to water should consider a more equitable relationship for the alternatives. For example, System 1 should have similar emissions to Systems 2a through 2c. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alternative residuals processing systems compared in this study, were based on the combination of mechanical, biological and thermal treatment methods. The term ‘treatment’ in this context is relatively synonymous with the term ‘processing’. All of these methods can to a varying degree reduce the total volume of waste disposed in landfill, and all have varying rates of material and energy recovery that result in specific differences in the potential environmental impacts associated with the systems. • System 1 does not have similar emissions to Air and Water in comparison to Systems 2a through 2c, based on the Life Cycle Assessment of the systems as described in Annex E-5.



Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Jason Balsdon</p> <p><i>Resident of Newmarket</i></p> <p>(cont'd)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern 2 – Placing residue, stabilized residue, and ash/char in a landfill will require long term monitoring and leachate control. Essentially the life of each alternative, from waste to inert material out, will be similar. Transporting the waste as Hazardous puts the long term problem on someone else; it is the same as shipping it to Michigan but with fewer trucks. Use of ash/char as an aggregate simply dilutes the material over a larger area and is unacceptable. • Solution to Concern 2 – The comparison of alternatives should consider that the life-cycle for waste to inert material is the same for each alternative. This will certainly affect the Net Life Cycle Energy Generation assessment and other comparisons for alternatives 2a through 2c. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The identification of long-term landfill capacity is outside the scope of this study, however, in undertaking a net life-cycle approach to the evaluation, the potential impacts from the landfilling of post-processing residuals was taken into consideration and is documented in Annex E-5.



Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Jason Balsdon <i>Resident of Newmarket</i> (cont'd)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern 3 – I am concerned that emissions to air was not provided a sufficiently high weighting in the assessment. This criterion is of the greatest importance because of: current problem with greenhouse effect, respiratory problems particularly with young and elderly, odours, and the irreversible future of the environment. • Solution to Concern 3 – A greater weighting should be provided to alternatives that release the least emissions to air and permit more “control” in the event that contingencies are required. For example, the alternatives that incinerate biogas should be preferred. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation methodology and criteria that have been applied to arrive at the consultants conclusion have gone through a rigorous public, agency and stakeholder consultation and has been approved by the MOE and then again taken to the public, agencies and stakeholders for confirmation. This consultation exercise and input from a wide variety of parties has resulted in an approach that to date has been supported by the MOE and the public. It is therefore this approach that was used in the evaluation of “Alternatives to”. The established priority related to Natural Environmental considerations (including the impacts to air and water) is a result of this rigorous consultation process. • The impact to Human Health will be assessed as part of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” (ie. Siting). During the evaluation of “Alternatives to”, all systems and technologies being considered must be able to “meet or exceed” all regulatory requirements. In Ontario, these regulatory requirements have been established in part to protect public health. • The impact to Human Health will be studied and addressed as part of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”, both at a generic level initially, and at a site specific level, once the long list of potential sites has been narrowed.



Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Jason Balsdon</p> <p><i>Resident of Newmarket</i></p> <p>(cont'd)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern 4 – Use of an alternative that requires “minimum” waste input will impact the effort and funds allocated to diversion. Periodic operation of a facility will not be effective from a cost basis or on protecting the environment. Solution to Concern 4 – The weighting of alternatives should prefer alternatives that can operate effectively on variable input volumes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation methodology and criteria that have been applied to arrive at the consultants conclusion have gone through a rigorous public, agency and stakeholder consultation and has been approved by the MOE and then again taken to the public, agencies and stakeholders for confirmation. This rigorous consultation exercise and input from a wide variety of parties has resulted in an approach that to date has been supported by the MOE and the public. It is therefore this approach that was used in the evaluation of “Alternatives to”. The established priority related to technical considerations (including the flexibility of the system to accommodate changing waste quantities and composition) is a result of this rigorous consultation process.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern 5 – I am concerned that the cost of the alternatives has been given too high a weighting in the evaluation. The emphasis of the alternative selection should be on an environmentally acceptable waste management alternative. Once the alternative is selected, a process could then be established to determine how the cost will be covered. Solution to Concern 5 - Minimize the weighting of cost in the evaluation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation methodology and criteria that have been applied to arrive at the consultants conclusion have gone through a rigorous public, agency and stakeholder consultation and has been approved by the MOE and then again taken to the public, agencies and stakeholders for confirmation. This rigorous consultation exercise and input from a wide variety of parties has resulted in an approach that to date has been supported by the MOE and the public. It is therefore this approach that was used in the evaluation of “Alternatives to”. The established priority related to cost is a result of this rigorous consultation process.



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
Robert Grimwood <i>Resident of Richmond Hill</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disgraceful that thermal treatment is the best course of action. The real solution is to address the problem at its source through such initiatives as manufacturer responsibility and optimized waste diversion. More public awareness is needed because the majority of people in York Region will continue to ignore the problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Durham and York Regions will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility to reduce the quantity of waste requiring management. The Regions of Durham and York are continually investigating new ways to encourage participation in waste management programs and events to ensure that the public understands the importance of waste diversion and the implications of not participating in these programs.
Rudy Cheng <i>Resident of Markham</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Cheng's father invented and patented an anti-pollution device which would enhance the effectiveness of the system and can solve "the garbage pollution problem". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information Received, no response required at this time.
Helmut Kik <i>Resident of Georgina</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement to build a system that has been in use for 6 or 7 years means that you are using an outdated solution. The newest technology should be used as it would be most effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regions of Durham and York have not specified a 6 or 7 year screening requirement for proven technologies. It is the intent of the Regions of Durham and York to find the most current and best available technology to ensure the facility(ies) constructed are "State-of-the-Art".
Shan Dhingara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes greater waste diversion (95%) and more emphasis on waste reduction and thinking of waste as a resource. Industrial, Commercial and Institutional waste needs to be included in the study. Put the emphasis of this project on energy not on waste. Increasing the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aggressive waste diversion targets established in this study are based on a detailed analysis of waste composition and the implementation of full blue box and green bin programs (refer to Annex C-1). The key to successful waste diversion will be to get all residents to participate and to participate effectively. The Durham/York Residual Waste Study is being completed to address the long-term waste disposal needs of the Regions of Durham and York, therefore, only those waste streams for



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	<p>energy not on waste. Increasing the amount and types of feed stocks allows for the facility to maintain energy output while still promoting the reduction of waste. Adding geothermal to the project would help increase the energy perception.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider multiple decentralized systems with numerous small facilities. 	<p>which they are responsible for management are considered as part of this study. Currently, the Regions of Durham and York are responsible for management of only a small portion of Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (IC&I) waste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Durham/York Residual Waste study is designed to consider post-diversion residual waste as a resource and not as traditional “garbage” to be disposed. The inclusion of Geothermal energy is outside the scope of this waste management EA study. For comparative purposes it was necessary to assume a consistent number of sites for each of the alternative systems. The rationale for this assumption is included in Annex C-2, Section 5.2.2. The ‘single facility, single site’ system configuration represents the most efficient system configuration and would provide the economies of scale that are being sought in the Durham/York study. In general, a ‘single facility, single site’ configuration also represents the configuration which would be expected to have a lower potential for environmental and social impacts, as the total land area required and number of potential receptors that could be impacted by the systems, increases as the number of sites required for each system increases. Based on facilities currently operating in Europe, it is likely that most of the technologies to be considered at the RFP stage will be larger facilities on a single site. However, the determination to site one facility on one site has not yet been made and will not be made until after the RFP stage in the process.



Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
<p>Adrian Cameron Nukt <i>Resident of Newmarket</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufacturers use excess packaging because consumers demand it. • The media is always negative toward incineration. • With landfills come issues with NIMBY. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durham and York Regions will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility to reduce the quantity of waste requiring management. • Thank you for your comments.
<p>Deborah Schulte <i>Resident of Woodbridge</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is apparent that incineration will have to be an integral part of our waste management system, however it should not be viewed as the answer to our waste management problems. • There are many significant programs that should be put in place in conjunction with the incineration component that would help to minimize the input into the system. • Recycling should be mandatory especially products that have ready markets. • Penalties and incentives need to be put in place in order to encourage good behavior and discourage bad behavior. • We need to make manufacturers responsible for minimizing their packaging and having incentives for those that do. We need equal the playing field for businesses that want to do the right thing but cannot compete with low cost, high waste imports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional diversion strategies are part of the overall waste management plan for the Region which includes full-scale Green Bin programs Region-wide. These types of programs and a greater level of public participation will be required in order to achieve the waste diversion targets that have been set as part of this study. • The Durham/York Residual Waste study is being completed to address the future waste management needs of Durham/York and the management of the waste that remains after at-source diversion. Strategies such as municipal at-source diversion programs and government initiatives are outside the scope of this study. Your comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Regional representative for consideration in the continual updating and refining of their waste diversion programs and systems to help achieve their aggressive waste diversion targets. • Durham and York Regions will continue to participate in initiatives to lobby provincial and federal levels of government on initiatives such as industry stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility to reduce the quantity of waste requiring management. • The Regions of Durham and York are working with their municipal counterparts and the provincial government in undertaking this EA study.



Comments and Responses
Annex F - Results of Public and Agency Consultation on Step 7
Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System.

Response to York Region Delegations May 17, 2006 **TABLE 3 (cont'd)**

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This is a complicated, multi-level government problem. When the problem is only discussed at the regional level then you are forced to deal with the waste without the power to change business in a big way.• Importance of having a strong education component to any strategy going forward. We need to promote civic responsibility for our production and disposal of garbage. It needs to be worked into the education system (taught in schools) and promoted in the media.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Education and the promotion of civic responsibility will play an important role in the Regions' ability to attain 60% waste diversion by 2011 and higher rates in future years.