



	Comment	Response
Resident from Bowmanville	A number of years ago the City of Toronto, through the Metro Landfill Siting Process, looked at the same site for building a landfill and rejected it. They looked at a number of things that the Durham/York Study Team did not, including a synergistic analysis with other plants i.e. St. Mary's, Darlington.	The Clarington 01 site was never considered through the Metro Landfill Siting Process. Where potential for cumulative effects exists, they have been analyzed and considered in the site specific studies i.e. traffic.
	The facility will interfere with airplane flight paths for Oshawa airport.	The Facility will meet all requirements set by Transport Canada. Potential interference with local airports was examined as part of the screening process.
	What about the seagull rookery at St. Mary's (seagulls are a protected species).	Migratory colonial nesting birds including Herring and Ring-billed Gulls are protected via the Migratory Birds Convention Act, which prohibits the killing or capturing of migratory birds, as well as any damage, destruction, removal or disturbance of active nests. St. Mary's Cement is approximately 4.5 km from the site, and as such, no direct impact to the nesting area of these birds is anticipated.
	Concerned about visual impact of facility from U.S.	Based on the results of the Visual Impact Assessment, given the presence of the other existing structures in the landscape, the presence of the Facility in addition to other planned and disclosed future projects would have a minimal effect on the landscape.
	Concerned about loss of physical and visual access to Lake Ontario.	The potential impacts to the lake view are outlined in the Visual Impact Assessment. The facility does not impede physical access to Lake Ontario.
	Has rail haul been considered?	Rail haul was considered as a part of this project, but was not studied in detail because it is best suited for long haul application and has the following disadvantages in the Durham/York situation:



	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rail haul option would require the construction of transfer stations to receive the waste and load it onto and unload it from the rail cars. The additional loading and unloading operation adds additional operating costs. The truck haul transfer stations are already in place and are currently used in the shipment of waste to remote landfills. • Even if the truck rail transfer stations were developed, a significant amount of truck haul (and the associated environmental effects) would be required to deliver the waste from the points of generation to these transfer stations. <p>In summary, rail haul was not considered in detail because it was deemed to be much more costly than truck haul and provide relatively minor benefits in return. We also note that the approved Terms of Reference for the project do not permit large quantities of waste to be imported from outside Durham and York Regions.</p>
	Was the OPG's 10 year traffic plan looked at when conducting the traffic study?	The 10 year full development of the Energy Park was included as a component of the traffic report.
Resident from Courtice	What is the impact of drainage from the stormwater pond discharging to Tooley Creek and ultimately to Lake Ontario?	The design of the Facility will include a stormwater pond on site and the discharge from the Facility will meet all applicable regulatory guidelines.
Resident from Oshawa	Will garbage, fly ash or bottom ash be shipped via the port at St. Mary's or Port of Oshawa?	No, the Facility will not utilize the port at St. Mary's or the Port of Oshawa.
	Will industrial waste be sent to the Facility?	Post-diversion industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) waste managed in small quantities by Durham or York Regions could be managed at the Facility, however



	Comment	Response
		this would require further approvals. Management of the majority of the ICI waste generated in the Regions is the responsibility of the firms and organizations that generate this waste.
Resident from Whitby	Concerned about Covanta's environmental compliance and labour force violations. Covanta has been fined a number of times for exceeding limits of Dioxins and Furans, SO2, NO2, Ni. Covanta has also been fined for labour force violations.	Unfortunately, the Consultant Team is unable to respond to comments regarding Covanta's environmental compliance or labour relations history.
Resident from Courtice	Concerned about Covanta's labour practices. What happens if Covanta exceeds emissions limits? Would the facility be shut down?	Unfortunately, the Consultant Team is unable to respond to comments regarding Covanta's labour practices. It should be noted that measures to be taken if Covanta is unable to meet the emissions criteria will be outlined in the Certificates of Approval, which have not yet been drafted. These will be completed during the detailed design stage of the project.
Resident from Whitby	In the economic study you said that the facility would create 400 jobs directly and 1,000 jobs indirectly. Would the labour force come from the local Durham labour pool?	Typically, the benefit would be to the local area. If there are enough local people to fill the jobs, it would be done locally.
	What is meant by 1,000 indirect jobs?	Indirect jobs include the spinoff jobs created to support a labour force. Examples include gas stations, accommodations, restaurants and other service industries.
	Concerned about cost of facility and the relatively small number of jobs created.	The creation of jobs is not the primary objective of this project. This facility is designed to provide a solution for the management of residual wastes in the Regions of Durham and York. Any jobs created either directly or indirectly will have a positive effect on the area and on the economy.
Resident from Ajax	Were Jacques Whitford or Stantec ever part of	Jacques Whitford was once a member of the Canadian



	Comment	Response
	the Canadian Energy from Waste Coalition?	Energy from Waste Coalition but is not presently. Both Jacques Whitford and Stantec are members of these types of associations for information purposes only. We may not necessarily support their mandate, but we need to be able to provide this information to our clients.
Resident from Ajax	The factsheet being distributed by Durham Region appears to refute the other factsheet provided at non-Durham or York-run events. The original factsheet provides references, however in Durham's hand out, references are not provided. Can we get access to these references? i.e fireworks display.	The factsheet distributed by Durham Region at the Public Information Centres and the appropriate references have been posted on the Study website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/reports.php . The fireworks reference was from a British report produced by the United Kingdom's Environment Agency regarding the SELCHP (South East London Combined Heat and Power energy recovery facility).
Resident from Bowmanville	Concerned about the number of people who don't understand this project and the lack of discussion regarding the potential negative impacts on the community.	Numerous opportunities for public consultation have been provided for residents and extra studies have been conducted in response to public concerns in addition to the site-specific studies. Based on the results of these studies, it was determined that no negative impacts are expected on the surrounding community as a result of the operation of the proposed Facility.
Resident from Bowmanville	The current emission limits for the proposed facility won't meet the new A-7 Guidelines. In Vancouver they hired Deloitte and Touche to do a study on green house gases from landfill vs. energy from waste. The results differed from the study conducted for this project. The Vancouver study showed that more greenhouse gases were produced by energy from waste facilities than landfill.	The proposed Durham/York Facility would be required to meet all existing regulatory air emission standards and the A-7 and EU 2000/76/EC guidelines. These limits will be defined in the Certificate of Approval (CofA) for the proposed facility and will be updated to reflect the proposed changes to the A-7 Guidelines. The report completed by Deloitte and Touche LLP and CH2M Hill Inc. for the City of Vancouver is not relevant to the proposed facility in Durham Region. In Vancouver, the Consultants were retained by the City to establish the financial value to the City of continuing to use their own landfill independently of plans by the much larger Metro Vancouver Region to use the landfill



	Comment	Response
		for its own purposes as an interim solution until the implementation of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan which includes Waste to Energy as the primary means of waste disposal. As such, the Consultants were looking at the issues from the perspective of a smaller member municipality's interests within the very much larger Regional context.
Resident from Courtice	Concerned about Covanta's compliance record and how residents will be notified if there is an exceedance.	Unfortunately, the Consultant Team is unable to respond to comments regarding Covanta's compliance record. Details regarding contingency plans for dealing with potential exceedances at the proposed Facility will be finalized at the detailed design stage in preparation for the application for the Certificate of Approvals (CofA) to be issued by the Ministry of the Environment.
Resident from Whitby	Concerned that a number of doctors in Durham Region and Europe oppose incineration.	We are aware that 75 Durham Region doctors have signed a petition registering their opposition to the proposed Durham/York Facility. Their concerns have been taken into consideration by the Study Team. With regard to the European doctors, an open letter was signed by organizations in the EU on behalf of the 33,000 physicians they collectively represent. The open letter sent to the European Parliament in 2008 was not sent with the intent of citing concerns regarding the health effects caused by incineration and opposition to this method of waste disposal. In the letter, Associations asked the plenary of the European Parliament to take into account health considerations when voting on the Waste Framework Directive and therefore oppose the reclassification of "efficient incineration" as recovery rather than disposal.
Question written on card, asked by moderator.	Will waste be shipped in from Toronto?	Waste from eastern non-Greater Toronto Area (GTA) municipalities, such as Peterborough or Northumberland,



	Comment	Response
		could be processed with waste from York and Durham Regions, but the operation of the facility does not depend on waste from outside of Durham and York Regions. The Environmental Assessment does not contemplate waste from Toronto being accepted at the facility so Toronto waste would not be permitted at the facility.
Question written on card, asked by moderator.	Why is the site not located in a more remote area?	The identification of the site was based on a rigorous evaluation process which included consultation with agencies and the public. This process led to the selection of Clarington 01 as the preferred site.
Resident of Port Perry	The CAOs of Clarington and Durham reached an agreement of a tipping fee of \$10/tonne for garbage trucked from Toronto. What will the tipping fee be?	This issue has to do with the Host Community Agreement. We do not have access to this information, but we will be looking in to it. The tipping fee can only be determined at the time when excess capacity is determined.
	Once operational, the facility will have excess capacity. Where will the garbage come from?	The initial capacity of the facility will be 140,000 tonnes/year. This includes 110,000 tonnes of waste from Durham, 20,000 tonnes from York and 10,000 tonnes used for contingency and seasonal fluctuations. Waste from eastern non-Greater Toronto Area (GTA) municipalities, such as Peterborough or Northumberland, could be processed with waste from York and Durham Regions, but the operation of the facility does not depend on waste from outside of Durham and York Regions. The Environmental Assessment does not contemplate waste from Toronto being accepted at the facility so Toronto waste would not be permitted at the facility.
	Concerned about the outdated figures in the business case for tipping fees.	The business case has been revised to reflect more accurate costs based on information provided by the Vendor and from the Host Community Agreement. This information was presented at the June 16, 2009 Committee of the Whole Meeting.
	According to the business case, the tipping fee will be \$55/tonne. However, real cost is shown	The business case numbers you have quoted are out of date. New numbers have been generated and have been



	Comment	Response
	to be \$250/tonne with 100% venture funding. It feels like Durham residents will be subsidizing garbage from other municipalities.	presented at the June 16, 2009 Committee of the Whole meeting. The report was made public one week before the meeting date.
	Concerned about the lack of time for reviewing the report between the release of the report and the committee meeting.	The review period provided for review of the draft EA documentation was approved by the Ministry of the Environment and is in accordance with the Approved EA Terms of Reference.
Resident from Newcastle	Concerned that only stack testing will be done and that only 5 parameters will be monitored continuously. Dioxins/furans will not be measured in real-time. Durham Council accepted the recommendation to not conduct soil, ambient air or agriculture monitoring programs, nor human biomonitoring. Monitoring that is occurring presents only a “snapshot” of what is occurring. How can Covanta say that there has never been a reoccurrence when so little is being monitored? How can Jacques Whitford say it is safe?	<p>With regard to chemicals of concern in incinerator emissions, the proposed Durham/York facility will incorporate all of the continuous monitoring specified under Ontario’s A-7 and EU 2000/76/EC criteria which are set based on Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) criteria. The Regions are also committed to continuous monitoring of process parameters including combustion temperature, pressure and oxygen levels, as defined in Ontario’s A-7 Guideline and EU 2000/76/EC. Dioxins and furans, for instance, will be continually controlled through these various other parameters.</p> <p>Based on the results of the Review of International Best Practices of Environmental Surveillance for Energy-from-Waste Facilities, human biomonitoring, ambient air monitoring and environmental monitoring (soil, vegetation, agricultural products) were not recommended by the Study Team as the inclusion of these additional monitoring options was not supported by the scientific review. The study team found that facilities that had an upgraded or modern pollution control system do not appear to be a significant source of chemicals detected in the area surrounding an incineration facility. Therefore, ongoing monitoring programs of these environmental media would not be required to ensure the protection of human or ecological health. Although motions to conduct ambient air monitoring and soil monitoring on</p>



	Comment	Response
		<p>an annual basis in accordance with best practices were initially defeated, a motion was passed at Durham Regional Council on April 1st that the Region of Durham reserve the right to add to the environmental surveillance program and determine the level of monitoring at the end of the process.</p> <p>The political decision makers at Durham Region have accepted the recommendation of the consultant based on the scientific evidence across the world, but have also reserved the right to make a final decision on the extent of monitoring at the end of the EA and EPA permitting process.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed Host Community Agreement with the Municipality of Clarington includes ambient air monitoring for the first 3 years of facility operation.</p>
Resident of Solina	What will Durham do if they can't have an EFW facility?	Durham Region is currently investigating a solid waste management strategy based on achieving a diversion rate of 70%. Currently the Region has solicited proposals for a Work Plan and Cost Estimate for the Development of a Detailed Business Case for the Implementation of the 70% Waste Diversion Strategy as reported to Works Committee and Council. However, if the plan to build the proposed Durham/York Facility is not approved, Durham Region will have to find another landfill in Ontario to accept their residual waste.
Resident of Toronto	Concerned that the air emission parameters being measured in Ontario (ie. NO _x , dioxins) are not protective of health. Has the installation of an AMESA system, currently being used in the EU, been considered?	<p>The air emission limits specified under Ontario's A-7 guidelines have been set based on Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) criteria. These regulatory limits are set to ensure the protection of public health.</p> <p>With regard to chemicals of concern in incinerator emissions, the proposed facility will incorporate all of the continuous monitoring specified under Ontario's A-7</p>



	Comment	Response
		and EU 2000/76/EC criteria. The Regions are also committed to continuous monitoring of process parameters including combustion temperature, pressure and oxygen levels, as defined in Ontario's A-7 Guideline and EU 2000/76/EC. Dioxins and furans, for instance, will be continually controlled through these various other parameters. Ensuring such operating parameters provide a combustion temperature above 850°C for example provides for the destruction of many of these emissions. It should be noted that continuous dioxin samplers do not provide accurate results. They are used in Europe, however they are used for information purposes, not for compliance issues.
	Concerned about the design of the stormwater management system.	The design of the Facility will include a stormwater pond on site and the discharge from the Facility will meet all applicable regulatory guidelines. Details regarding stormwater management can be found in the Surface Water and Groundwater Assessment located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/epa_studies.php .
Resident of Bowmanville	Concerned about the lack of public consultation events and the "information smothering strategy" that is going on. Questioned why the Air Quality Assessment and Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment are being released on the Friday before a long weekend.	Close to 100 public information events have been held to date. All of these sessions were advertised using a wide variety of media, including newspapers, radio ads and the project website (www.durhamyorkwaste.ca). Members of the public were also welcome to attend the Site Liaison Committee (SLC) and Joint Waste Management Group (JWMG) meetings. These meetings were open to the public and anyone interested was invited to attend and participate. These meetings provided the same opportunity as "Public Information Sessions" for interested persons to get involved in the project, provide feedback and comment, and to speak to study representatives directly about their concerns.



	Comment	Response
		The Air Quality Assessment and Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment are being released on the Friday before a long weekend because this is when the documents will be finalized. This schedule has been approved by both Durham and York Regions.
	Requested that a public information centre be held in west Durham so that other residents don't have to travel so far.	Regional Council provides direction on where public information centres will be held according to public space availability, size and location of facility. We are aware that numerous requests were made to Committee and Council to hold additional public information centres in west Durham; however these requests were not approved.
	Requested references for the factsheet entitled "Energy from Waste in Perspective: Facts, May 12, 2009" prepared by Durham Region as well as the sources for the greenhouse gas estimate.	The factsheet distributed by Durham Region at the Public Information Centres and the appropriate references have been posted on the Study website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/reports.php .
Resident from ?	Concerned about the effects on Lake Ontario since effects will be felt within 1 km of the facility, which includes the lake.	The results of the site-specific assessments have not identified any potential adverse effects on Lake Ontario.
	Concerned about CFL light bulbs (curly bulbs) being burned in the Facility, especially the calorific value and the mercury content.	Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing contaminants, such as waste that contributes to the amount of chemicals and heavy metals in the waste stream, is Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and other product stewardship programs. Durham and York Regions apply continuous efforts to ensure the effectiveness of these measures through promotion and education campaigns, the development of Community Environmental Centres, and Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO). The Region has provided disposal programs for items such as CFL bulbs which residents should use instead of disposing of these items in the garbage.
	Has the study team considered the impact of tour buses since the Facility will have a viewing	The Traffic Impact Assessment did consider tour buses and assumed that one tour bus per month would visit the



	Comment	Response
	gallery and will hold tours?	Facility.
Resident from Port Hope	Why is incineration being considered instead of plasma gasification?	The RFP process invited vendors to submit proposals for any type of technology, which could have included plasma gasification. However, no submissions for technologies using plasma gasification were received. As a result of the RFP evaluation process, incineration was selected as the preferred technology with Covanta as the Preferred Vendor.
	I left 25 copies of a publication with reception at Durham Region to be distributed to the Councillors. Where did they go?	Durham Region staff will look into this immediately and will check with the Clerk's Department to see what was done with your documents.
Resident of Ajax	Concerned that comments from peer reviewers will not be considered due to short time lines and the public will not get to see the reviews.	Comments from the peer reviewers have been included in the EA documentation and will be made public with the submission of the EA.
	Would like to receive hard copies of reports previously issued.	The public can contact the Clerk's Department at Durham Region to request hard copies of reports pertaining to this study.
Resident of Bowmanville	Concerned about impacts on property values and that some people are considering moving because of the project. Feels that property assessments should reflect the tax revenue.	With respect to tax revenue, this will be discussed in the Host Community Agreement. Impacts on property tax were included in the Social/Cultural report. When sited properly, these facilities can actually increase revenue. i.e. new companies may move in as the energy produced at the facility could cut down on energy costs. There is no indication that the proposed Facility will have a negative impact to property values. It will be situated in the industrial park.
Resident of ?	Concerned that the EA process has been driven from the beginning towards energy from waste and that zero waste was not properly considered.	The Terms of Reference developed at the start of the project drive the decision making process. It was established that landfill would not be an option and various processing technologies (including pyrolysis, gasification, incineration, etc) were examined which resulted in the selection of thermal treatment as the preferred system. The ultimate decision of which type of technology was made through the RFP process.



	Comment	Response
		Zero Waste initiatives including recycling, composting and diversion of household hazardous waste have been investigated as part of this project. Waste diversion is a high priority for both Durham and York Regions. As a result of public feedback through the consultation process, the proposed thermal treatment facility is being designed to handle Durham and York's residual waste only after 60% diversion has already been achieved. In future years, the diversion rate will have to increase to even higher rates to offset the effects of population growth in the Regions. The Regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote diversion programs, such as recycling and composting, so that these diversion targets can be met and to reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility. It should be noted that Durham Region has a high diversion rate and is one of the leading municipalities in Ontario with regards to diversion.
Resident of Orono	In 2008, Durham was striving for 70% diversion by 2010. They are now looking at 2013 – 2015 to meet that target. How firm are Durham's targets?	Durham Region is currently investigating a solid waste management strategy based on achieving a diversion rate of 70%. Currently the Region has solicited proposals for a Work Plan and Cost Estimate for the Development of a Detailed Business Case for the Implementation of the 70% Waste Diversion Strategy as reported to Works Committee and Council. The Regions diversion targets will be outlined once the 70% Waste Diversion Strategy has been developed. The Regions are committed to investing in, encouraging and promoting diversion programs, such as recycling and composting, so that these diversion targets can be met.
	What is the contingency plan until the facility is operational in 2013?	If, as is currently planned, the Michigan border closes to the transportation of Ontario waste at the end of 2010, Durham and York Regions will have to find landfill capacity in the Province of Ontario for the interim period until the Facility is operational in 2013. The details of



	Comment	Response
		such a contingency plan have not yet been released, but in order to minimize the problem Durham Region is currently investigating a solid waste management strategy based on achieving a diversion rate of 70%.
	Questioned who has decided on such tight timelines and what is driving the June 24 th deadline.	Durham Regional Council has directed that the Study be completed by June 24, 2009. York Region will review the EA documentation on June 25, 2009 and a decision on whether to submit the EA documentation to the MOE will occur on June 26, 2009.
	Has Dr. Kyle commissioned an independent peer review?	Ross Wilson and Dr. Lesbia Smith have been retained to conduct an independent peer review.
Resident of Bowmanville	Questioned why residents should believe in the Study Team and their results, especially since the Study Team doesn't live in the area.	As a consulting company, Jacques Whitford is held to professional standards and has no vested interest in the outcome of this project. We have conducted technical studies to provide you with the scientific basis of the analysis of this project and are here to assist in going through this process.
Resident of Whitby	Concerned that there is no sorting done at the facility to remove items such as CFL bulbs.	Covanta's proposal indicates that the truck scale typically has sensors for medical and other unacceptable volatile waste. Additionally, personnel directly involved in the handling of incoming refuse will be trained and instructed to identify and deal with non-processible or unacceptable waste. On a periodic basis, random audits will be conducted on trucks. Unacceptable waste will be removed and set aside for disposal at an appropriate facility. It is ultimately the responsibility of residents to safely and properly dispose of items containing potentially hazardous waste such as CFL bulbs since they have been provided with the tools and programs.
Resident of Whitby	Will any bad odours be emitted from the facility?	Waste is shipped in fully enclosed trucks to minimize odours and is tipped inside the building. The doors to the Facility are closed before tipping so that odours do



	Comment	Response
		not escape. Air used for the combustion is drawn from the tipping floor which causes a negative pressure in the building, further minimizing the opportunity for odours to escape.
Resident of ?	What happens if there is a change in Regional or Provincial legislation which requires more stringent levels of compliance? Who will fund this?	It should be noted that the Regions will meet or exceed all required regulatory emissions criteria, including Ontario's A-7 Guidelines and EU emission standards. This includes any revised air emission limits that have been proposed for the A-7 Guidelines. Any costs associated with such changes would be the responsibility of the Facility owner, which in this case would be the Regions of Durham and York.
Resident of ?	What will be the impact of truck traffic 24 hours/day on Darlington Park?	The facility operates 24 hours/day, however, waste will only be received during regular business hours - Monday to Friday and occasionally Saturdays if there is a statutory holiday during the week. Truck traffic will therefore occur mainly during regular business hours. Potential impacts as a result of this truck traffic were discussed in the Traffic Impact Assessment located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/epa_studies.php .
Resident of Newcastle	Would like a guarantee from Dr. Kyle that the pollutants will not cause harm.	Unfortunately, we cannot comment on Dr. Kyle's position which he presented at the June Committee and Council meetings and which is recorded in the minutes of those meetings.
Resident of Orono	Questioned what York's role in project is and where their garbage is going.	York Region currently has a contract to process 100,000 tpy at the Dongara waste pelletizing facility in Vaughan; however, facility construction was only recently completed and markets for the product are currently under development. The Dongara contract ends in 2028 and York may choose to send its waste to the Durham/York facility at that time. In the meantime, York has contractually agreed to send 20,000 tpy to the Durham/York facility at initial operation.
	Questioned the Study timelines.	Durham Regional Council directed that the Study be



	Comment	Response
		finished by June 24, 2009 for Council review.
Resident of Whitby	Comments about Covanta's labour relations and environmental compliance.	Extensive programs are in place for environmental compliance at all Covanta facilities. Covanta's goal is 100% compliance all the time but if exceedances occur Covanta will take a problem solving approach, find out what went wrong and address the issue. The consultant team is unable to further respond to detailed comments regarding Covanta's environmental compliance history.
Resident of ?	Concerned about health risks posed to workers near Facility.	The Facility emissions will meet or will be below the air contaminant emission limits placed on municipal waste incinerators by the current version of Ministry of the Environment (MOE) Guideline A-7 (dated 2004). This will be verified through continuous monitoring of stack emissions and annual stack tests. A Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment (HHERA) was undertaken for the Durham/York Residual Waste Study. Overall, the results of the HHERA indicate that there would be no adverse health effects to either human or ecological receptors exposed to emissions from the Proposed Thermal Treatment Facility.
	Asked if emissions compatibility study had been finished.	An Air Quality Assessment Technical Study Report was completed. Emissions from the Facility are predicted to meet applicable air quality criteria for all contaminants during normal operation (Facility operating continuously at maximum capacity).
Resident of Courtice	Wants something less intrusive to the environment.	We would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham/York Residual Waste Study and for taking the time to submit your comments and concerns regarding this project. Your comments have been noted by the project consultant team.



	Comment	Response
Resident of Bowmanville	Questioned the noise level of the Facility with truck traffic.	The Project is expected to generate up to 35 trucks per day in the Base Case scenario with a waste throughput of 140,000 tonnes per year (tpy) and up to 77 trucks per day in the Alternative Case 2 scenario with the ultimate processing capacity of 400,000 tpy. No traffic control measures are required on the adjacent road network to accommodate traffic during operations of the Facility. In all cases noise levels at nearby receptors are within federal and provincial noise criteria.
	Concerned about traffic and air quality from shipping waste and ash.	The air quality model predictions indicate the cumulative impact of the proposed Facility emissions (stationary plus mobile sources, including vehicle emissions) in conjunction with the background concentrations would comply with the NAAQO and CWS criteria in all cases for NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO and PM _{2.5} .
Resident of ?	Comments on elected officials.	We would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham/York Residual Waste Study and for taking the time to submit your comments and concerns regarding this project. Your comments have been noted by the project consultant team.
Resident of ?	Concerned about odour from garbage.	Waste is shipped in fully enclosed trucks to minimize odours and is tipped inside the building. The doors to the Facility are closed before tipping so that odours do not escape. Air used for the combustion is drawn from the tipping floor which causes a negative pressure in the building, further minimizing the opportunity for odours to escape.
Resident of ?	What is the recognition and reward program?	Please contact the Region of Durham to find out more about their programs.
Resident of ?	Comments about over-packaging and need to reduce litter.	We would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham/York Residual Waste Study and for taking the time to submit your comments and concerns regarding this project. Your comments have been noted by the project consultant team.



	Comment	Response
Resident of ?	Concerned about effect on Lake Ontario and drinking water.	The results of the site-specific assessments have not identified any potential adverse effects on Lake Ontario.
	Concerned about location near schools.	A Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment (HHERA) was undertaken for the Durham/York Residual Waste Study. Overall, the results of the HHERA indicate that there would be no adverse health effects to either human or ecological receptors exposed to emissions from the Proposed Thermal Treatment Facility.
Resident of ?	Opposed to incineration.	We would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham/York Residual Waste Study and for taking the time to submit your comments and concerns regarding this project. Your comments have been noted by the project consultant team.
Resident of ?	Concerned about effect on Lake Ontario and drinking water.	The results of the site-specific assessments have not identified any potential adverse effects on Lake Ontario.
	Concerned about increased traffic near EFW.	The Project is expected to generate up to 35 trucks per day in the Base Case scenario with a waste throughput of 140,000 tonnes per year (tpy) and up to 77 trucks per day in the Alternative Case 2 scenario with the ultimate processing capacity of 400,000 tpy. No traffic control measures are required on the adjacent road network to accommodate traffic during operations of the Facility.
	How high will the stack be?	The stack will be approximately 86m high.
	Concerned about health risks to Clarington residents.	A Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment (HHERA) was undertaken for the Durham/York Residual Waste Study. Overall, the results of the HHERA indicate that there would be no adverse health effects to either human or ecological receptors exposed to emissions from the Proposed Thermal Treatment Facility.
Resident of ?	Commented that Site is on a fault line and questioned what would happen in the event of an earthquake?	The facility will be designed to accommodate the appropriate earthquake zone conditions at the site.



Comments and Responses
Public Information Sessions on the Draft EA and Site-specific Sessions
May 12, 2009

	Comment	Response
	Comments on Dr. Kyle's position on EFW safety.	Unfortunately, we cannot comment on Dr. Kyle's position which he presented at the June Committee and Council meetings and which is recorded in the minutes of those meetings.
Residents of?	Various comments against incineration.	No response needed.