

# **The Regional Municipality of Durham**

## **MINUTES**

### **ENERGY-FROM-WASTE SITE LIAISON COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, May 20, 2009**

A meeting of the energy-from-waste Site Liaison Committee was held on Wednesday, April 8, 2009, in the lower level boardroom (LL-C), Regional headquarters building, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby, ON, at 7:00 p.m.

Present: R. Walli, Chair  
M. Clayton  
G. James  
T. Ali  
K. Coupland  
C. Wedge  
J. Vinson  
Councillor C. Trim  
Councillor M. Novak  
Councillor A. Foster  
N. MacDonald, Manager, Waste Management, Region of York  
J. Szwarcz, Project Manager, Special Projects, Municipality of Clarington

Absent: R. Yates, with regrets (called in via teleconference)  
M. Ashcroft, with regrets  
F. Langmaid, Manager, Special Projects, Municipality of Clarington, with regrets  
M. Januszkiewicz, Director, Waste Management, Region of Durham, with regrets  
G. Borchuk, Project Manager, Waste Management, Region of Durham, with regrets

#### Staff

Present: C. Curtis, Commissioner of Works, Region of Durham  
G. Anello, Manager, Waste Planning and Technical Services  
T. Lavery, Communications Officer, Region of Durham  
M. Smart, Administrative Assistant, Works Department (Recording Secretary)

#### Also

Present: Regional Chair Roger Anderson, attended for part of the meeting  
Regional Chair Bill Fisch, attended for part of the meeting  
E. Mahoney, Commissioner, Environmental Services, Region of York  
J. McKay, Jacques Whitford  
C. Ollson, Jacques Whitford

## **ENERGY-FROM-WASTE SITE LIAISON COMMITTEE**

Richard Walli, Chair of the energy-from-waste (EFW) Site Liaison Committee (SLC), welcomed everyone and advised that the protocol for the meeting remained that following any presentation, the SLC members will first ask questions, provide comment or discuss the presentations and/or reports. Following this, members of the public will then be invited to ask one question at the end of the meeting which is to be limited to five minutes. Should someone want to pose multiple questions, they must line up again to ask another single question in order to provide everyone a chance to speak.

## **MINUTES**

Moved by Clarence Wedge that the minutes of March 4 be accepted, seconded by Kathy Coupland and carried.

## **DELEGATIONS**

Louis Bertrand, 124 Liberty Street North, Bowmanville

---

Mr. Bertrand remarked that he felt there were not enough venues made available for members of the public to provide input. He asked that the SLC make a recommendation to the Joint Waste Management Group (JWVG) and the Regional Municipalities of Durham and York that they delay review of the draft Site Specific Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment until the peer reviewer has completed their review and allow due time to consider this report. Mr. Bertrand commented on his concern about comments made by Dr. Ollson concerning chemicals. Mr. Bertrand also questioned the reason why Lake Ontario was not mentioned, if emission fallouts would land on Lake Ontario and reach the Regional Municipality of Durham (Region's) drinking water.

Discussion followed Louis Bertrand's delegation concerning the timing of reports and where they would be presented. Cliff Curtis advised that a meeting was being held by the Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2009, at which the reports would be considered. Concern was also raised with regard to the provision of adequate time for the peer review administered by the Municipality of Clarington. It was moved by Margaret Clayton, seconded by Tracey Ali and carried, that the EFW SLC suggest to the JWVG to allow adequate time for peer review and submission to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for the Site Specific Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment and Air Quality Assessment.

## **MEETING**

The site specific technical studies were discussed and received for information including: draft Economic Assessment, draft Acoustic Assessment, draft Facility Energy and Life Cycle Assessment, draft Social/Cultural Assessment, draft Surface Water and Groundwater Assessment, draft Traffic Assessment and draft Visual Assessment. It was questioned the reasons why 'in general' the studies that are being brought forward

do not provide many negatives. Jim McKay responded that the process involves indentifying ways to mitigate possible negative impacts that may arise and include the need for future audits. It was also clarified that some audits would be included as commitments in the environmental assessment (EA), legislations such as the MOE would be responsible for ensuring other commitments are met (such as water) and that effects and conditions would be monitored at varying levels responsible by different organizations.

## **PRESENTATIONS**

Dr. Chris Ollson provided a presentation on the results of the Air Quality Assessment and the Site Specific Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment (Attachment No. 1).

Discussion ensued regarding limits of detection and measurement of particulate matter. A member of the SLC questioned why the area being tested increased from one kilometre to two kilometres. Dr. Ollson advised that due to an increase in stack height (60 meters in the generic study and 87.6 meters in the site specific study), dispersion would cover a larger area and although not resulting in higher concentrations, the two kilometres provided an extreme. It was also questioned if the project team was studying 400,000 tonnes of municipal waste per year to which the project team advised the results would be available in approximately three weeks. Discussion also ensued with regard to the handling of fly ash as it relates to being a non-fugitive issue.

Consideration made to the facility's ability of handling 400,000 tonnes of waste was discussed in relation to the requests for proposal (RFP) as issued for 140,000 tonnes annually.

Richard Walli confirmed with the members of the SLC that their discussions were complete and proceeded to advise the members of the public in attendance at the meeting that they were invited to speak for a maximum of five minutes per single question.

The first speaker was Paul Woodcroft. He questioned Dr. Ollson's ability to provide statistics on the possible impact to the environment and health from a facility that had not yet been built. Dr. Ollson commented on the air and risk assessment modeling and the required works involved in formulating such information.

The second speaker was Libby Recanski. She spoke regarding the Tooley Creek wetland. She advised of her concern that coastal wetlands are rare and that they provide a nursery spawning area. Concern for the returning resident habitat species was discussed and a request was made for three kinds of mitigation in writing: purchase eastern part of wetland, reforest by Durham/York and leopard frog monitoring. With regard to waterfront access and property, Cliff Curtis advised that the property on the south side, which was acquired during the water pollution control plant build, has been authorized by Council to be transferred to Clarington. Also, during the water pollution control plant build, negotiations included a waterfront trail. Public access will be provided. Dr. Ollson spoke to the importance of baseline species.

The third speaker was Ashley Bridgeman who questioned why the Consultant was asked by the Regions to complete the 400,000 tonnes testing and why suddenly. Jim McKay advised that the final EA is to assess what is actually being built, 140,000 tonnes, and that current comparison testing at a different tonnage capacity would assist in verifying future capabilities.

The fourth speaker was Doug Anderson who spoke to the criterion in Ontario and mortality figures. He commented on the direct multiplication of the intensity and danger of increased chemicals. Mr. Anderson advised of his awareness of the medical association and questioned if with regard to the CMA, if methodology was more valid. Dr. Ollson clarified that the multiplication of chemicals was by individual chemical and not a direct additive.

The fifth speaker was Kerry Meydam who commented that there were no safe levels of some pollutants, for example dioxins. She also questioned how multiple exposures were analyzed and how, without full monitoring, how accuracy and validity are proven. Also commenting on the impacts of the cumulative effects and how they were considered. Dr. Ollson advised that the environmental surveillance best practices report was tabled through the Region. Council resolution from April 1, 2009, was read aloud which advises that prior to submission, "...the Region of Durham reserves the right to add to the environmental surveillance program and monitoring to be determined at the end of the process with a majority vote." Dr. Ollson also advised that the MOE is also provided an opportunity to direct the level of environmental surveillance, as required and set out by the approvals process (Certificate of Approval).

Kristin Robinson was the sixth speaker. She questioned Dr. Ollson about the proportionate values and commented that she felt the report did not include child specific rates. Dr Ollson indicated that child and toddler assessments were included in the report.

The seventh speaker was Gary O'Connell. He requested clarification from Dr. Ollson about the use of the models and their accuracy. Dr. Ollson clarified baseline measurements and the use of conservative variables that overestimate the outcomes and discussed technologies.

The eighth speaker was Wendy Bracken. She discussed her concerns with regard to the proximity of contaminant quantities to their legislative limits, noting specific pages and types. She also requested that tables be provided in the final report to provide a "real idea" in tonnes or kilograms of the 140,000 and 400,000 annual results over the period of 30 years. Dr Ollson indicate that many of these values were in the report but stated that he will ensure quantifiable values would be in the final report.

The next speaker was Barry Bracken. He discussed the possible relation between soft tissue sarcoma and incinerators. He also questioned the number of EA that were submitted to the MOE and not approved. Dr. Ollson advised that there have been EAs that have been denied and that the MOE does maintain a listing which is available for review (O. Reg. 153/04.)

The tenth speaker was Linda Gasser whose concerns included fly ash stabilization process and impacts. Jim McKay and Dr. Ollson spoke to the process and possible destinations, procedures and compliance.

The next speaker was Paul Kuebler. He inquired about the facility's operating capabilities at 100 percent efficiency. He also inquired about the emissions removed and fly ash generated during upset conditions. He also requested that the in the air quality report, a table be included to show upset conditions. Dr. Ollson advised that there a number of variables and that the details should be able to be contained in the air report.

The twelfth speaker was Brenda Cross who spoke about her concern for nanoparticles, the inability for them to be measured, controlled or captured. She advised that she felt that the report showed uncertainty. Dr Ollson explained that particulate matter was considered in various forms within the report.

The thirteenth speaker was Louis Bertrand. He questioned if the effects had been considered on the bee population and commented on the Air Quality Assessment and the Facility Energy and Life Cycle Assessment.

The last speaker was Wendy Bracken (second question) who commented that the risk assessment was not an exact science noting that checks and balances were not being provided. She also requested the accuracy of ground level concentrations be provided by percentile.

The meeting adjourned at 10:11 p.m.