

TABLE 2
INCORPORATION OF COMMENTS/FEEDBACK RECEIVED INTO THE
PROPOSED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) TERMS OF REFERENCE – “ALTERNATIVE METHODS”

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
SECTION 1: AREA SCREENING CRITERIA	
<i>Question No. 1 -Do you agree with the screening criteria that are proposed to identify suitable areas? Are there additional screening criteria that should be applied?</i>	
⇒ The majority of the participants agreed with the screening criteria as presented in the Workbook. The only criterion that did not get full support from participants was the exclusion of lands around federally regulated airports.	⇒ The screening criteria as proposed at the workshops have not been revised. Setbacks from federally regulated airports are required by Transport Canada and these requirements will be reflected in the application of this screening criterion.
⇒ Additional criteria suggested include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Municipality should be a willing host. ◇ Social/Site equity - an area that has already hosted a waste facility in the past should be excluded from future consideration unless the “community” and not the municipality have agreed to host new site via a referendum. ◇ Atmospheric and meteorological determinants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ A municipal “willing host” screening criterion has not been included since the subsequent site selection process will include the identification of “willing seller” sites. ◇ The step-wise siting methodology proposed (i.e. starting with the entire Study Area, then moving progressively to sites) has been maintained. This approach has proven to be acceptable with respect to the requirements of the EA planning process. ◇ Atmospheric conditions will be considered at comparative evaluation and the site-specific preliminary design stages.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Wetlands and waterways with appropriate separation distance. ◇ Should be as close to major road (i.e. 404) as possible. ◇ Should avoid sites, which will result in heavy truck traffic where none exists currently. ◇ Exclude designated tourist areas – a Waste Disposal Site including an incinerator is not compatible with tourism promotion. ◇ The land use of bordering municipalities. ◇ The provincial government is looking for alternative sources of energy of which an energy from waste facility would be of benefit. The federal government supports the Kyoto Accord, which calls for a reduction of green house gases. A reduction in the number of trucks traveling several kilometres each day to dispose of waste in the U.S. or other land fill sites would be of benefit. Reduced truck traffic on major highways (i.e., 401) would reduce the ‘wear and tear’ of high volumes of traffic on the province’s infrastructure as well as municipal roadways. This could potentially reduce the capital costs of infrastructure improvements for all levels of government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Wetlands and waterways of appropriate priority to be considered at the area screening step will be excluded by the proposed screening process and further considered in the comparative evaluation step. ◇ Proximity of alternative sites to appropriate infrastructure will be considered as part of the comparative evaluation process. ◇ Impact to existing road networks will be considered as part of the comparative evaluation process. ◇ The exclusion of designated tourism areas has been added as an additional area screening criterion. ◇ If required at a later siting step, given the relative location of a prospective site, land uses within adjacent jurisdictions would be considered. ◇ The Regions of Durham and York have initiated the Residual Waste Study for many of the reasons articulated in this comment.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Aboriginal concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The concerns of First Nations must and, therefore will, be taken into consideration in the siting process. Consultation throughout the EA process will include First Nations and other Aboriginal groups.
<i>Question No. 2 - Do you agree with the proposed process for identifying potential sites described in the Handbook?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ While there were a few participants who chose not to respond to this question, most of the participants indicated that they were in agreement with the proposed process for identifying potential sites as described in the handbook. Most felt that the process was logical and the only reservation pertained to using multiple sites throughout the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The proposed methodology for identifying potential sites, at “Step 4” of the siting process, has not been revised.
<p>⇒ Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Not enough specifics if willing host means the community or its politicians. A referendum should be held to confirm “willing host” by any community. ◇ How about location near some industry i.e., General Motors, who could use energy from waste disposal. ◇ What about looking at contaminated sites or hydro right-of-ways (i.e. marginal lands, old industrial sites, etc.?) ◇ Sites should be held to same standard or criteria including those with existing C of A. Areas that have already hosted a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Identification of a “willing host” municipality will not be considered at “Step 2” of the siting process. Also, see responses to Question Number 1 above. ◇ See Question Number 5 below. ◇ The “land use compatibility” criteria to be applied at “Step 5” of the siting process will accommodate this comment. ◇ The existence (either current or prior) of other waste management facilities on or in proximity to sites is not a reasonable approach to

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
site should be excluded unless the residents are for it.	exclude sites from identification.
<i>Question No. 3 - Do you think privately owned land should be considered without it being offered by the property owner?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ This question was relatively spilt with regards to agreement by participants. Roughly half of the participants did not agree with this question while the remainder either provided no answers or were in agreement. For example, either people felt that expropriation was not to be considered or that it might be the best method for finding a site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Given the inconclusive input received, this part of the identification of proposed sites, at “Step 4” of the siting process has not been revised. Input on this question will be solicited again from the public, agencies and stakeholders once a preferred technology (ies) has been selected.
<i>Question No. 4 - Do you agree with the factors used to identify additional private sites within suitable areas? Are there any additional factors that should be considered?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of the participants agreed with the factors used to identify additional private sites within a suitable area. Most felt that there should not be a high cost associated with infrastructure and that the site should be easily accessible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ There have been no revisions to this part of the “Step 4” identification of additional-privately owned sites.
<p>⇒ Additional Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Willingness of community. ◇ Proximity to industry that could use energy, what do other countries do? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ See response to previous comments regarding “willing host” considerations, above. ◇ “Land use compatibility” factors to be applied at “Step 5” of the siting process will accommodate this comment. The project team is continually researching and monitoring existing systems; similar to what may be applicable in Durham/York, throughout North America, Europe and the World to see what is working in other parts of the World and how these experiences may be applied in Durham/York.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<i>Question No. 5 - Do you agree with the criteria proposed to identify potential sites for the short list? What priority should be given to these criteria (High, Medium, Low, or Remove)? Are there any additional criteria that should be considered?</i>	
<p>Proximity to Required Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ More than half of the participants felt that this criterion should be rated high, while the remaining participants indicated that it should be of medium or low priority. Most participants felt that it would be less expensive if it were near infrastructure; however there was the idea that infrastructure can be built to suit the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ When evaluating alternative sites “proximity to” required infrastructure will be considered. The relative priority of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”.
<p>Site Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The responses provided by the participants indicated that there was generally a high priority level associated with site accessibility with some medium and low priority levels suggested. The high priority was related to cost and efficiency, while low priority responses indicated that infrastructure could be built. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ When evaluating alternative sites, “site accessibility” will be considered. The relative priority of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Potential Impact of the Haul Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of the participants indicated that this criterion had a high priority and that there was a need to protect residential areas from increased traffic and wastes. <p>Property Size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The responses to this Item indicated a high to medium priority as participants felt that there is flexibility to build on any size that is required for present and future needs in case of expansion. ◇ Comments concerning site adaptability/expandability were also provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ When evaluating alternative sites, “potential impact of the haul route” will be considered. The relative priority of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”. ◇ When evaluating alternative sites, “property size” will be considered. Site size determines the size of the on-site buffer zone and hence the magnitude of the off-site impacts. The nature and magnitude of these off-sites impacts were generally considered a higher priority. The relative priority of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”.
<p>Land Use Compatibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ In general, this Item was split between the three levels of priority. The majority of the people felt that current land use must be compatible with the facility (e.g., no agricultural land) as well as aesthetic impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ When evaluating alternative sites, “land use compatibility” will be considered. The relative priority of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”
<p>Availability of Site</p>	

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ This Item was split between high, medium and low priority. Participants commented on the need for a willing host, while others felt that the Regions could purchase what land they need and that public lands should be used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ When evaluating alternative sites, “availability of site” will be considered. The relative priority of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”
Proximity to Un-regulated Airports	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of participants felt that this criterion had a low priority value, unless there would be an impact to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ When evaluating alternative sites, “proximity to Un-regulated Airports” will be considered. The relative priority of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”
<p><i>Additional Criteria and Comments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Tourism/Cultural Heritage – need to consider how this type of facility might impact tourism and existing cultural heritage features with respect to: traffic, odour, air, water and noise. ◇ Proximity to “alternative energy” users (e.g. steam from a waste-based co-generation plant). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Inclusion of Designated Tourism Areas and Areas within an appropriate separation distance of these lands will be considered as an additional criterion in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step in the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”. ◇ Application of the “Land Use Compatibility” criterion will include consideration of industries that could use the products of a waste-based co-generation facility.
SECTION 5: COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA	
<p>Question No 6 <i>Make any additions to the list of criteria and indicators that you feel should be considered by Durham and York Regions in the evaluation of potential sites. To the extent possible, please provide an explanation of your choices and suggestions.</i></p>	

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Public Health and Safety and Natural Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Suggested criteria by the participants included the temperature of the process water returned into a water body, green house gas emissions, noise/air quality, locally significant natural heritage areas, and the impact to aquifers and wells. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the priority rankings assigned by the public.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Suggested rewording of the “Air Quality Impacts” indicators to add “odour impacts” and “noise”. ◇ Suggested rewording of “Water Quality Impacts” indicators to include the “quality of the body of water that might be impacted”. ◇ Participants suggested that additional indicators such as “migratory patterns of wildlife” (both on the ground and in the air), “the prevailing wind direction”, “typical emission zones, with the number of residents in the zone”, “type of soil substrate”, amount of “mineral resources to which access could be affected”, and “facility security lighting” (that would produce light pollution to the surrounding area without significant pre-existing light sources). ◇ One participant suggested that the category “Public Health and Safety” and “Environment” be identified as separate categories. 	

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Social and Cultural Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Additional criteria for this category identified by participants include using zoning-approved sites, and proximity to tourist areas. ◇ Suggested rewording of the “Residential Areas” criterion to read “Number of residences with an appropriate distance from the site as well as possible future residences likely to be built within the lifespan of the facility.”” ◇ Suggested rewording of the “Traffic” indicator to address potential to build better road network and the type of traffic along with existing and projected volume. ◇ Additional comments by participants focused upon the education of the community throughout the process, social equality, protection of aboriginal and heritage sites, impacts on recreation and aesthetics and cumulative impacts of multiple facilities at single locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the priority rankings assigned by the public.
<p>Economic / Financial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ No additional criteria or text modifications were provided for the economic / financial category. ◇ Additional general criteria and indicators included emission credits, reduced taxes, the technology lifespan, future revenues and the reclamation of the site once use is finished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the priority rankings assigned by the public.
<p>Technical Suitability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ An additional indicator for the “Technical Suitability” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>category was suggested: “Proximity to Rail.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ One participant suggested that there was a need to identify the choice (i.e. the preferred alternative method or site) prior to applying the “Technical Suitability” criteria. 	<p>comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the priority rankings assigned by the public.</p>
<p>Legal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ No additional criteria or text modifications were provided for the “Legal Considerations” category. ◇ Additional comments by participants addressed sustainable financing, compensation to adjacent property owners and site zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the priority rankings assigned by the public.
<p><i>Question No 7. For the criteria identified in Question #6 under each of the five categories, identify the priority ranking of each criterion as “High”, “Medium”, or “Low” as compared to the other criteria within each category.</i></p>	
<p>Public Health and Safety and the Natural Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of participants indicated that air and water quality should have a high level of priority, while environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) should have a medium to high level of priority, and vegetation should have a low to medium level of priority. Comments provided by participants regarding air and water quality indicated that there is support to have minimal impacts to both the air and water from this project as there is the potential to affect human health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The proposed criteria presented to the Public will be utilized in the draft EA Terms of Reference with any modifications described in this summary document. Due to the number of participants at the public consultation events, the relative priorities of this criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” in the EA study.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Participants felt that ESAs would already be removed further to the earlier screening step, that there is a need to protect ESAs and that ESAs would be vulnerable to ecological changes. Vegetation comments indicated that vegetation can be replanted and will not be impacted if the waste is contained on the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The proposed criteria presented to the Public will be utilized in the draft EA Terms of Reference with any modifications described in this summary document. Due to the number of participants at the public consultation events, the relative priorities of these criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” in the EA study.
<p>Social and Cultural Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ In general, participants indicated that the “Residential Areas” and “Compatibility with Existing and/or Proposed Land Uses” criteria should have a “high priority” level, while “Institutional Facilities”, archaeological and cultural resources, and traffic impacts-related criteria should have a medium level of priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The proposed criteria presented to the Public will be utilized in the draft EA Terms of Reference with any modifications described in this summary document. Due to the number of participants at the public consultation events, the relative priorities of these criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” in the EA study.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Comments provided by participants indicated that an appropriate use of land is essential and it would be best to use brownfields. Comments also indicated that opposition from residents would be great, and that there would be the need for a large buffer zone. Comments pertaining to archaeological and cultural areas indicated that cemeteries should be included in the criteria, as well as buildings or areas with significant heritage attributes, and that aboriginal sites should be respected, although a few participants felt that these areas could be moved if required. Participants commented on the need to examine the types and hours of traffic flow as well as the need to stay away from small roads but that the roads could be adjusted if required. It was mentioned that traffic would not be an issue if the facility were located near infrastructure. ◇ Other comments associated with the “Social and Cultural Environment” category included health issues, recreational impacts, aesthetics, aboriginal concerns, the separation of this from land use as a specific category, the creation of active and standing committees with the affected communities, and site screening opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative “methods” or sites will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the priority rankings assigned by the public. ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative “methods” or sites will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the priority rankings assigned by the public. ◇ The degree of public consultation and the need for the establishment of specific committees will be addressed as part of the consultation plan developed as part of the EA Terms of Reference and implemented throughout the EA study. For additional detail on consultation and communications, refer to EA Terms of Reference Summary Reports No. 3 (Both Durham and York) and the respective comment summary tables.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Economic / Financial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ In general, capital costs were mainly thought to be of medium priority while operation and maintenance costs were suggested to be a high level of priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The proposed criteria presented to the Public will be utilized in the draft EA Terms of Reference with any modifications described in this summary document. Due to the number of participants at the public consultation events, the relative priorities of these criterion will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” in the EA study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Comments provided by participants associated with capital costs included cost/benefit analysis as being essential, the need to be efficient and not waste money, that these costs can be tied in with operation and maintenance costs, and the comparison to the costs of exporting the wastes. Operation and maintenance cost comments indicated that costs could not compromise the final decision, while other participants indicated that there would always be costs associated with any of the projects so this should not be an issue. Other comments associated with this criterion included an impact on taxes and the economy, and future revenues. ◇ Other comments associated with the economic / financial category included the need to fund future facilities with development fees, the need to consider the economic impact on the community and the need to look at the short and long-term impact on the Regional Budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the proposed priority rankings assigned by the public.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Technical Suitability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Participants indicated that compatibility with existing infrastructure was of medium to high priority while design and operations was generally regarded as high priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The proposed criteria presented to the Public will be utilized in the draft EA Terms of Reference with any modifications described in this summary document. Due to the number of participants at the public consultation events, the relative priorities of these criteria will be confirmed in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders as the first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” in the EA Study.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Comments regarding the compatibility with existing infrastructure included removing this criterion from this section as it is an economic criterion, that it would depend on the type of infrastructure, the proximity to rail and that costs would be kept low if the infrastructure were similar. Design and operations comments indicated that state of the art design would be best, also most efficient, should be able to add onto it as needed, and that the Regions should not experiment with technologies not currently in use. Other comments regarding technical suitability included the ability to upgrade the technology and ease of upgrading to adapt to new technologies.</p>	<p>◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the proposed priority rankings assigned by the public.</p>
<p>Legal</p>	

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of the participants indicated that the complexity of required approvals and agreements were both of medium to high priority. Approval comments consisted of the need to fast track the approvals and the understanding. In addition, it was questioned who would be the authority on the approvals. Participants considered that all required agreements should be as simple as possible. Other comments regarding the complexity of required approvals and agreements criteria included using buffer zones/setbacks and dealing with financial issues such as financial support and compensation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Proposed evaluation criteria and indicators will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the proposed priority rankings assigned by the public.
<p><i>Question No 8: After reviewing proposed criteria for each of the five categories, what priority do you think should be given to the overall siting categories? Are there any additional categories that should be considered? The same indicators cannot be used twice in different categories. Many of the indicators of Public Health and Safety (e.g., air quality, water quality) also impact on the Natural Environment category. Therefore should Public Health and Safety be a separate category or included with Natural Environment?</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ In general, participants indicated that the “Public Health and Safety and Natural Environment” as well as the “Technical Suitability” categories were of a high priority level. The majority of the participants felt that the “Social and Cultural Environment” and the “Economic / Financial” categories were of medium priority and that the “Legal Considerations” category was of low priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ This input will be used to establish the relative priority of each of the categories and will be factored into the evaluation of alternative sites. The initial step in the EA Study, with respect to the evaluation of alternative sites, will be to confirm the proposed criteria and indicators as well as the proposed priority rankings assigned by the public.
<p><i>Additional comments included:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Some participants indicated that health and safety of residents is a high priority and should be broken out of this category (public health and safety and natural environment). Others felt that there was reasonable rationale to continue to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The proposed categories for evaluation criteria will be updated as comments are received on the draft EA Terms of Reference. The initial step in the EA Study will be to confirm these proposed categories.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>combine both within a single category.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Insufficient data available regarding these priorities and these choices are only estimates at this time. ◇ Need to protect public health and safety and the environment. ◇ Future capacities should be considered if waste will be received from other areas. 	<p>categories.</p>
SECTION 6: CONSIDERATION OF VENDORS' SITES	
<i>Question No 9: Do you agree with the consideration of sites offered in proposals from technology vendors as outlined in the Handbook?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of the participants agreed with the consideration of sites offered in proposals from technology vendors and most qualified this support by stating that sites offered by vendors should only be considered if they are located in the Study Area (or in reasonable proximity) and complied with the Study’s siting criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ At this stage it is proposed that vendors be permitted to submit alternative sites and that these sites will be incorporated into the site selection process and undergo a similar comparative evaluation process with the preferred Municipal Site.
<i>Question No 10: If you agree with considering additional sites through the RFP process: do you agree with the proposed conditions that would be applied to sites introduced at this stage in the process? If you have suggestions for other conditions, please add them in the spaces at the bottom of the table.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of the participants felt that the site must be located within Ontario. Many felt that the waste should be dealt with where it was created. A few participants did not agree and felt that the best location was where the waste could be treated most effectively. ◇ The majority of participants indicated that if the site is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ At this stage in the process it is recognized that the public would prefer any proposed sites offered up by vendors be located in Ontario, and would give greater preference for sites that are located within the boundaries of Durham or York Regions.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>located in the Study Area, it must meet the same criteria proposed for the preferred site established further to the Durham/York Study. Comments included the need to have the same process should be followed as was used to select the municipal sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The majority of participants felt that if the site is not located in the Study Area it must have a Certificate of Approval to receive residual wastes from Durham and York. Some comments indicated that this option should not be investigated. ◇ Almost all of the participants agreed that the proponent must have an approved Terms of Reference and be in the process of completing an EA to obtain the required approvals to be considered as a potential alternative site. Again, some participants felt that the site should not be located outside of the Study Area. 	
SECTION 7: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
<i>The following are additional comments about the workshops:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ I have a problem in understanding site versus market. For instance, a disposable diaper facility is in Peel, but that is considered a “market” and not a “site” in your EA, a definition of site is needed to separate what is considered a site vs. a market. ◇ There is a need for a greater amount of information to be given to the local residents. <p><i>The following are additional comments about the process:</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ A number of these comments reiterate input provided in earlier parts of the proposed siting methodology, while other comments have been discussed in the other workshops on “Alternatives To” and “Public Consultation.” Finally, a number of these comments fall outside the scope of the EA Study.

Comment Received	How it was incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ The process should emphasize the importance of recycling and reducing the amount of waste produced. ◇ The need to keep the facility within the boundaries of the Regions. ◇ A willing host must come from the community not politicians. ◇ Region should join in applying political pressure to reduce waste and emissions at source such as industry/manufacturing and packaging. <p><i>The following are additional comments about future facilities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ There is a need for future plans to be included in the selection of the site (e.g., a larger facility might be best as expansion may be required). <p>General additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Incinerators may be the best option and are getting cleaner. ◇ Has the site been selected yet? ◇ Need for additional promotion and education to promote diversion. 	