

TABLE 3
RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT REVIEW TEAM (GRT) COMMENTS
ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) TERMS OF REFERENCE

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Malcolm Horne, Heritage Planner, Heritage and Libraries Branch <i>Ministry of Culture</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Heritage will need to be addressed as it is in any Environmental Assessment. • It is unlikely that cultural heritage will need to be addressed in the evaluation of alternative approaches and systems. • Need to include impacts to cultural heritage in the evaluation of alternative sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As outlined in Section 6.2 - Step 6 and Appendix F, Table F-3, Social/Cultural considerations including “Potential impact on archaeological and cultural resources” will be included as part of the comparative evaluation process. • Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 includes additional detail on what is meant by “archaeological and cultural resources”. This will include a review of documented sites as well as a review of the potential for uncovered resources that could be potentially located at a prospective site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Malcolm Horne, Heritage Planner, Heritage and Libraries Branch Ministry of Culture <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the involvement of the Ministry of Culture, consultation with municipal heritage planners and committees, and municipal planning departments, should be completed throughout the EA process to ensure that cultural heritage resources, in particular, those with local significance are identified early. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regions of Durham and York will work with their respective Regional and Local Municipal Planning Departments at the initiation of evaluation of “Alternative Methods” to identify local cultural heritage groups and organizations that should be consulted during the completion of the siting evaluation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that experts in built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes should be involved in the EA and, as appropriate, in the evaluation of alternative sites and site design to ensure best practices in cultural heritage conservation and sympathetic design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the likely-hood of the preferred site being located in an existing industrial area, it is unlikely that there will be any impacts to existing built heritage landscapes. However, should a potential impact be identified, the appropriate technical experts would be consulted to ensure minimal impacts to heritage landscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Malcolm Horne, Heritage Planner, Heritage and Libraries Branch Ministry of Culture <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that a licensed archaeologist be consulted to provide an inventory of known significant archaeological sites within the study area that are of high levels of significance in order to ensure that such sites are avoided where feasible. It is recommended that once a site is chosen, an archaeologist be consulted to perform an assessment of the chosen site in order to determine whether archaeological resources will be impacted. This work should be completed in accordance with the standards outlined in the Ministry of Culture's Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the detailed comparative evaluation of short list sites, consideration will be given to Archeological and Cultural Resources. Criteria regarding the potential impact on Archeological and Cultural resources will be applied. The need for site-specific archaeological assessments will be determined, based on the frequency, in the area surrounding the sites, of archaeological discoveries including burial sites and in consultation with the Ministry of Culture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the post EA process, strategies should be outlined for the early involvement at all stages of professional experts in archaeology (licensed professional archaeologists), built heritage and cultural landscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As required, during the final stages of the site selection process, professionals in the areas of archaeology, built heritage and cultural landscapes will be consulted to ensure minimal impacts to these resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Paul Schafer, Senior Program Officer, Ontario Region Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unlikely that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) will apply to this project. • Potential triggers for application of the CEAA will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the proponent is a Federal Authority; - If a Federal Authority provides funding for the undertaking; - If a Federal Authority makes Federal lands available; or, - If a Federal Authority issues certain permits or licenses or other approvals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock wording provided by the MOE/CEAA will be incorporated into Section 6.6 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stock wording provided by the MOE/CEAA has been incorporated into Section 6.6 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference.</i> • <i>It is proposed that should a potential CEAA trigger be identified, the exact relationship between the proponents, the provincial government and the Federal government in completing a coordinated EA Study be determined at that time.</i>



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Bruce Singbush, Manager, Planning Projects <i>Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Table F-1, which outlines preliminary exclusionary criteria, the first bullet should be extended beyond provincial legislation to include plans or policies. Items such as the Provincial Policy Statement, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and Greenbelt Plan also must be considered when selecting suitable sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the criteria “Exclude designated lands located within areas protected by Provincial/ Federal legislation” recognition will be given to the Provincial Policy Statement, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and Greenbelt Plan. Additional detail on this criteria can be found in Background Document 2-3, Table 2-1 and Background Document 2-5, Sections 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 which describe the Provincial Policy Statement 2005, Greenbelt Protection Act, and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act and how they could apply to the proposed undertaking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
M.S. Wolczyk, Manager, Marketing & Planning <i>GO Transit</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time, but would like to be kept apprised of subsequent EA work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Ray Valaitis, Rural Planner <i>Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns at this time, as prime agricultural lands will be excluded from site consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Anik Guertin, Environmental Health Assessment Officer <i>Health Canada</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request information regarding the identification of CEAA (Canadian Environmental Assessment Act) triggers either now or in the foreseeable future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on comments provided by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (see above) there are currently no triggers with respect to this undertaking that would require the project to be subject to the requirements of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
John Langley, Director, Investment Branch <i>Ministry of Economic Development and Trade</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Randy McGill, Manager, Environment Greater Toronto Airports Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.5 under Transportation Systems should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The Pickering Lands (owned by Federal Govt.) were declared as an airport site in August 2001. To protect Federal Lands for future aviation needs, the Pickering Airport Site Zoning Regulations (AZR) have come into effect on September 2005. The AZR restrict the height of buildings, structures and objects, including natural growth on regulated lands and protect aircraft from potential hazards such as bird strikes and electronic signal interference <i>for a distance of up to 15 km off the end of each runway.</i>” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.5 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6.2 will be updated to include a reference to the Pickering Lands as a designated airport. • Appendix “F”, Table F-1 identifies screening criteria that will include the screening of areas around federally regulated airports as per Transport Canada Guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Section 5.5 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6.2 have been updated to include a reference to the Pickering Lands as a designated airport.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Rebecca Earl, Environmental Officer <i>Transport Canada</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek to avoid developments that would attract birds into proximity with airports. Specifically, Transport Canada cautions against the siting or expansion of landfills within 15km of an airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note, in accordance with the proposed purpose of the undertaking, we will not be siting a landfill site, but rather a waste processing facility, that will likely include all waste drop-off operations within a closed environment. Appendix “F”, Table F-1 identifies screening criteria that will include the screening of areas around federally regulated airports as per Transport Canada Guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since birds are known to travel up to 60km between roosting and feeding sites, strict bird management plans may need to be developed for waste facilities that are within a 60km zone of an airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) level studies to be completed in order to receive the Certificate of Approval to operate the facility, a bird impact management plan will be developed as required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Rebecca Earl, Environmental Officer <i>Transport Canada</i> (Cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks are greatest where an airport lies between a water body and a landfill, as this may cause bird flight paths to cross aeronautical flight paths. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note, in accordance with the proposed purpose of the undertaking, we will not be siting a landfill site, but rather a waste processing facility, that will likely include all waste drop-off operations within a closed environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Michael DeAngelis, City Manager <i>City of Vaughan</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft represents a comprehensive approach to the issue of residual waste disposal. Section 5.5 does not make reference to Hwy 427, which currently ends at Hwy 7 in Vaughan. An EA is currently in progress by the Province to address existing transportation issues in the area and the movement of goods to and from the CPR Intermodal Terminal in Vaughan. This EA study will likely be completed, and the preferred alternative may be in place, by the time that the undertaking of the Durham/York study is ready to be implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment. Section 5.5 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6.1. will be updated to include a reference to Highway 427 extending into York Region through the City of Vaughan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Section 5.5 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6.1. have been updated to include a reference to Highway 427 extending into York Region and terminating at Highway 7.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Paula Brown, Planning Officer, Operational Research and Development Bureau Ontario Provincial Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time, but would like to continue to be consulted throughout the EA process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
James T. Kyle, Manager of Policy Planning Town of Aurora	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Table F-1, <i>Wellhead Protection Areas</i> and <i>Infiltrations Areas</i> should be included as examples under the third bullet (Exclude designated Natural Heritage Features and Areas within an appropriate separation distance of these designations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table F-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-3, Section 2.2 will include a reference to <i>Wellhead Protection Areas</i> and <i>Infiltrations Areas</i> as examples under the third bullet (Exclude designated Natural Heritage Features and Areas within an appropriate separation distance of these designations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Table F-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-3, Section 2.2 have been updated to include a reference to <u>Wellhead Protection Areas</u> and <u>Infiltrations Areas</u> as examples under the third bullet (Exclude designated Natural Heritage Features and Areas within an appropriate separation distance of these designations).</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>James T. Kyle, Manager of Policy Planning on behalf of the Town of Ajax</p> <p>Town of Aurora</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study should have regard for municipal official plan policies, such as Aurora's Waste Disposal Policies, and Environmental Management Policies Regarding Solid and Hazardous Waste Processing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EA study will consider all existing legislation, including municipal official plan policies. Background Document 2-5 provides an overview of the different legislation that may apply, especially, in the siting of a waste processing facility. During the siting process, applicable policies will be reviewed including, Aurora's Waste Disposal Policies and Environmental Management Policies Regarding Solid and Hazardous Waste Processing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
<p>Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax</p> <p>Town of Ajax</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several references in the draft and background documents point towards thermal treatment as the preferred outcome, despite the stated "Purpose of Undertaking" to consider physical, biological and thermal processing. Mechanical or biological treatment would not produce electricity, so thermal treatment should be considered to be a focus of the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are currently not aware of any references in the Proposed EA Terms of Reference of Background Documents that point to thermal treatment as the preferred outcome. The list of "Alternatives to" the Undertaking, identified in the EA Terms of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
		<p>Reference represent those that have been determined to be reasonably available to address the purpose of the undertaking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note, the Purpose of the Undertaking is to “...recover resources – both materials and energy - ...”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mechanical Processing can recover materials for recycling. – Biological Processing can recover materials for composting and energy from waste. – Thermal Processing can recover energy from waste. • The consideration of these alternatives will be completed in a “systems” context as outlined in Section 6.1 of the EA Terms of Reference which will identify a range of systems utilizing a combination of these technologies to process the 	



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax</p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ash from thermal treatment would require separate disposal, and this is not provided for by this ToR. 	<p>post-diversion residual waste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The identification of a landfill site to manage the process residue from a long-term Durham/York facility falls outside the scope of this EA Study. However, section 4.0 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference outlines a number of options available to Durham and York to secure this disposal capacity. Section 3.1 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference outlines the possibility of accepting MSW from neighbouring non-GTA municipalities in return for the provision of landfill disposal capacity for process residues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “Alternatives to” should include rationale as to how landfill was excluded from the EA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfilling of residual waste without any form of processing has been excluded from consideration as it does not meet the proposed Purpose of the Undertaking which is to “...recover resources – both materials and energy - ...”. Background Document 2-1, Section 2.1 outlines additional rationale for the exclusion of a landfill only alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question the completion of the EA in accordance with Section 6.1(2) of the EA Act, which means this will be a “full” EA and that the proponents are not taking advantage of the opportunity to “scope” the range of alternatives under consideration or the range of environmental effects to be addressed, as provided for by Section 6.1(3). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Durham/York Residual Waste Study is being completed as an Individual EA and therefore will be completed in accordance with Section 6.1(2) of the EA Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “Alternatives to” evaluation criteria should be more specific – the actual indicators to be used in conducting evaluations under each criterion should be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed specific indicators to be utilized in the evaluation of “Alternatives to” have been included in Background Document 2-2, Section 4.2, Table 4-1. These criteria and indicators will be reviewed and confirmed with the public and agencies at the outset of the evaluation of “Alternatives to”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When evaluating “Alternatives to”, regulatory requirements comprise a minimum standard. Technologies that exceed these requirements will be given preference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental performance of alternative systems is addressed by the natural environment criteria used to evaluate the “Alternatives to”, as outlined in Background Document 2-2, Section 4.2, Table 4-1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “natural environmental considerations” in Table E-1 seem to refer only to the potential for energy from waste to displace the use of non-renewable fuels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The displacement of non-renewable fuels is only one of the three components of the Natural Environmental criteria as outlined in Background Document 2-2, Section 4.2, Table 4-1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax <i>Town of Ajax</i> <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for energy to waste plants to emit contaminants such as mercury and dioxin is well known. The “alternatives to” criteria should require consideration of emissions of specific contaminants and describe their potential health and environmental effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation of “Alternatives to” will be based on the most current data available on emissions from waste processing facilities. • As outlined in Section 3.1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference, only those approaches capable of meeting or exceeding regulatory requirements will be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vigorous public education component should be included in the process in order to enable thermal treatment to be considered in the context of its relative environmental effects compared to other disposal alternatives, including landfill. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the EA study, the proponents will be reviewing their communications strategies to ensure that the most up-to-date information is available to the public to assist in public education and allow the public access to the necessary data to make informed decisions throughout the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As process moves toward preferred site selection, the public will not accept deferral of important environmental issues to the MOE A7 Guideline (“Combustion and Air Pollution Control Requirements for New Municipal Waste Incinerators”) or the EPA process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to compliance with MOE Guideline A7, the comparative of evaluation of “Alternatives to” will address the impacts related to emissions to the atmosphere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The process should evaluate the risks and effects of “worst case” contingency situations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix E-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference includes criteria related to the technical risks and reliability of the waste management alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If preferred “alternative to” requires more than one facility, should be rationale as to whether to develop these on a single site or on more than one site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of sites required will be dependant on the preferred “Alternative to” identified and the capacity of a facility(ies) at peak operating performance. This decision, and the need to consider more than one site will be determined at the RFP stage outlined Step 7 of the siting process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Evaluation of Long List to Produce Short List, the proximity to sensitive land uses must be considered as part of the land use compatibility evaluation in Step 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As outlined in Section 6.2, the proximity of a site to sensitive land uses will be evaluated as part of the land use compatibility evaluation in Step 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires more detail on the methodology for the process of identifying the short list of sites in Step 5; including the priorities to be assigned to the criteria and the process to be undertake to identify candidate sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The priorities to be assigned to the evaluation categories identified in the Proposed EA Terms of Reference will be confirmed as part of Step 1 of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The locational criteria should not include sites that have direct frontage onto Hwy 401 or arterial roads, due to visual impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation of potential impacts of siting the long-term facility(ies) will be dealt with as part of the comparative evaluation of the short list of sites. Visual screening requirements will be addressed as part of the approvals required under the EPA and Planning Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the ToR consultation plan, area municipalities should be specifically identified as interested parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area municipalities are included in Section 7.1 under the heading “Governments and Agencies” In addition, local area municipalities form part of the formal Government Review Team which has been identified by the MOE to review and provide comment on the Proposed EA Terms of Reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 7-1 should include commitments to meetings with public liaison groups, First Nations and interested local and other government representatives, as well as with the public, at each stage of the EA process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultation plan outlined in the EA Terms of Reference, including Table 7-1, commits to consulting with all applicable parties at each step in the process where public and agency input is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a consultative committee of local government representatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the development of the EA Terms of Reference a “Joint Waste Management Group” (JWMG) was formed consisting of both political and public representatives from both Durham and York to administer the study process. Refer to Appendix C, Schedule A for the Terms of Reference for this JWMG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultation plan should include a substantial educational component regarding issues surrounding waste management practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout the EA study, a broader range of consultation techniques will be considered in order to reach a greater number and range of potential participants in the process. At each point of consultation, the proponent will provided the necessary technical background to ensure the public and stakeholders have the necessary information to make an informed decision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology described in Background Report 2-3 should be described in the formal Class EA document to demonstrate a public commitment to a systematic and traceable process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note the Durham/York Residual Waste Study is being completed as a full “Individual” Environmental Assessment. In order to receive EA approval for the undertaking, the proponent must demonstrate the process used during the study and the decisions made were done in accordance with the approved EA Terms of Reference and in a traceable and replicable manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology should include a step to define study areas within which the environmental effects would be significant, in order to show the screening criteria and ensure consistent treatment of all siting alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The identification of study areas or “impact zones” will be completed throughout the siting process, primarily in the application of the proposed screening criteria in Step 2, where areas and lands within an appropriate separation distance are screened from further consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ToR should describe the field surveys and analysis that will take place – such as obtaining up to date data that may not be found in published documents such as land use, site topography and drainage, water quality, air quality, haul route characteristics and environmental features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the siting evaluation process, the need to complete specific field surveys and analysis in order to complete the detailed comparative evaluation will be reviewed and addressed at that time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assignment of low, intermediate, or high impact as described in Background Document 2-3 will not fully represent the degree to which the effects of alternatives are different from each other. E.g. an alternative site may be assigned a “low” even if it has a relatively high impact, simply because it is the “least bad” among the alternatives. Such errors would be compounded when ratings are combined with community priorities to produce rankings of sites. Assignment of impact levels should be base on professional judgment as the magnitude of the impact, even if all impacts under a criterions are “high” or “low” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comparative evaluation process to be undertaken at the siting stage will be qualitatively based and will recognize priorities as defined by the public and stakeholders, as well as a combination of technical data, and professional judgement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With reference to the site selection methodology, the number of “high” ratings is not a clear determinant of the advantages and disadvantages of the undertaking. An advantage would be the use of a Brownfield or the close proximity of infrastructure. A disadvantage would be a significant environmental impact. In many instances a low rating would be a neutral result, not an advantage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comparative evaluation process to be undertaken at the siting stage will be qualitatively based and will recognize priorities as defined by the public and stakeholders, as well as a combination of technical data, and professional judgement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, although there is a “Public Health and Safety and Natural Environment” category, there are no public health criteria. The site evaluation criteria should include potential effects on human health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will consider, in consultation with appropriate agencies, undertaking a health risk assessment of the preferred site and technology(ies) during the EPA level studies. The first step of the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” will be to confirm the proposed evaluation criteria and make any modifications necessary in consultation with the public, agencies and stakeholders and the MOE. This comment will be addressed at the appropriate Step in the EA Study process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Gary Muller, Acting Manager, Planning, on behalf of the Town of Ajax Town of Ajax <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the preferred alternative includes thermal treatments, the ToR should commit to preliminary risk assessment of all the short listed sites, and the preferred site should be subjected to a complete environmental and health risk assessment covering both routine and contingency conditions with full stakeholder involvement and peer review. This should be undertaken as part of the EA process, even though it would also contribute to consideration of the undertaking under the EPA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will consider, in consultation with appropriate agencies, undertaking a health risk assessment of the preferred site and technology(ies) during the EPA level studies. In order to receive all necessary approvals to operate the long-term facility, all applicable legislation will be reviewed and followed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The traffic impacts criterion should include consideration of traffic safety, which would involve the selection of a haul route, and the environmental effects and cost of any required road improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comparative evaluation of the short list of sites will include consideration of traffic safety, including identification of the preferred haul route, and required infrastructure improvements. This comment will be addressed at the appropriate Step in the EA Study process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects <i>Municipality of Clarington</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.1 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference – a reference should be included regarding the value of publicly accessible waterfront land, which is a scarce resource in the GTA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although important, this level of detail is not usually included at the EA Terms of Reference stage. This comment will be considered and addressed during the EA study at the evaluation of Alternative Methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.4 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference – you mention quality of life for York Region, but not Durham Region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.4 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference will be updated to include information on the quality of life for both Durham and York Regions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Section 5.4 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference has been updated to include information on the quality of life for both Durham and York Regions.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.4.1 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference – University of Ontario Institute of Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University of Ontario Institute of Technology will be included in Section 5.4.1. of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The University of Ontario Institute of Technology has been added to Section 5.4.1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.7.</i>



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects Municipality of Clarington <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glossary of Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) - Organic – add, “except carbon dioxide” at the end. - Powder Activated Carbon (PAC) – define adsorb - Units of Measurement – Consider explaining orders of magnitude. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended revisions will be made to the Glossary of Terms in Appendix A of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The recommended revisions have been made to the Glossary of Terms in Appendix A of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects</p> <p>Municipality of Clarington</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rationale behind excluding landfill as a possible alternative is too weak. • For example, the Regional Council Policy not to develop any more landfills could be changed at any time. Council Policy changes quite often, and there is no provincial policy that would exclude landfilling from consideration. • Furthermore, the two previous failed attempts to site landfills in Durham also do not provide adequate rationale for excluding landfill as a possible alternative. It was a provincial government decision to take over the Region's previous siting process and a provincial decision to end the IWA process in 1995. These previous landfill siting processes failed for political reason, not because there were no suitable sites for a landfill in Durham Region. • Lastly, public opposition to landfill does not justify its exclusion, especially since there will be opposition to any new facility (e.g. incineration) that is proposed through this process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfilling of residual waste without any form of processing has been excluded from consideration as it does not meet the proposed Purpose of the Undertaking which is to "...recover resources – both materials and energy - ...". • Background Document 2-1, Section 2.1 outlines additional rationale for the exclusion of a landfill only alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects</p> <p>Municipality of Clarington</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Papers acknowledge that public participation in the Workshops to develop the ToR has been very light, and therefore the opinions of those people that attended should not be portrayed as representative of those of the general population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summaries of Public Consultation Events held to date recognize that turnout to these events has typically been very low. Recognizing this fact, the EA Terms of Reference has made a commitment at the initiation of evaluation of “Alternatives to” and “Alternative Methods” to go back out to the public and confirm the comments provided during development of the Draft EA Terms of Reference. As well, throughout the EA study, a broader range of consultation techniques, such as polling, will be considered in order to reach a greater number and range of potential participants in the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects</p> <p>Municipality of Clarington</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale for recovering energy from a York/Durham facility is weak. Ontario is facing an energy crisis – however it is not Durham’s or York’s responsibility to provide energy to their residents nor to solve Ontario’s energy crisis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Region’s of Durham and York recognize that the provision of energy in Ontario is a Provincial directive and the responsibility of the Government of Ontario. However, the Regions’ have identified the provision of an alternative energy source as source of revenue generation for the respective Region(s) and therefore are pursuing Energy-from-Waste alternatives with this in mind. In addition, the development of an EFW facility also has the potential ability to attract new industry and growth to an industrial area, based on the energy outputs of the facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects Municipality of Clarington <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ToR Section 3.1.5, p.9 -statement regarding Clarington Waste going to Michigan: isn't it disposed at the Richmond Landfill in Napanee? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently all waste generated in Durham Region with the exception of waste generated in Brock Township is transported to the State of Michigan for Landfilling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-1, p.14 – discuss in greater detail the implications of not reaching the desired waste diversion targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the outset of the evaluation of “Alternatives to” will be a review of additional at-source diversion, at which time the ability of Durham and York to reach the goal of 60% waste diversion by 2011 will be determined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-1, Table 7-3 – include a column to indicate the percentage increase in diversion rates required from current rates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information is available by comparing current diversion (2004) as presented in Tables 3-1 and 3-2 with diversion planned for 2011 as presented in Tables 7-3 and 7-4. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects <i>Municipality of Clarington</i> <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-1, Table 7-5 – A definition of Dongara needs to be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Dongara proposal is explained in Background Document 2-1, Section 3.2.5. York Region is currently not considering this proposal and the reference to Dongara in the table has been removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>Background Document 2-1, Tables 7-6 and 7-7 have been changed to remove any reference to Dongara.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects</p> <p>Municipality of Clarington</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Background Document 2-1, p. 27 – acceptance of waste from other municipalities would create unnecessary resistance for the public. • It may be inconsistent with the Purpose of the EA, which is to deal with the residual waste from York and Durham regions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of waste from municipalities outside Durham and York Regions would only be considered if it was to the benefit of the residents of Durham and York. In particular, the potential may exist to receive waste from neighbouring non-GTA municipalities that may, in return, provide disposal capacity for processing residues generated by the Durham/York facility. • The Purpose of the Undertaking, as stated in Section 3.1 of the EA Terms of Reference includes the potential for management of waste from neighbouring non-GTA municipalities that may, in return, provide disposal capacity for processing residues generated by the Durham/York facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects Municipality of Clarington <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-2, p. 26 – the discussion of the impact related to landfilling includes the high truck volume associated with landfills. Yet the volume of residual waste will be the same regardless of the chosen preferred alternative, and therefore the truck volume will be the same, whether the destination is a landfill or an alternative facility such as an incinerator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The volume of residual waste could vary significantly depending on the type of technology utilized in the preferred long-term system. As result, the truck traffic required to manage the post-processing residue will be unknown until the preferred “Alternative to” is selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-2, Table 4-1, Social/Cultural Considerations – If nuisance impacts are determined only on operational experience, newer technologies with limited operational experience will be biased against. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To determine nuisance impacts for the full range of technologies, including those with extensive operating histories and those that are considered “new and emerging” the evaluation of nuisance impacts will be completed based on not only operational experience but on a range of technical evaluations including, type of equipment to be used, operational procedures, facility design, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects Municipality of Clarington <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-2, Table 4-1, Social/Cultural Considerations – Clarify what is considered to be a “land use conflict” – e.g. what type of land use, distance from receptors, distance of travel along roads used by local traffic, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Step 1 of the evaluation of Alternative Methods will be completed to identify specifically each evaluation category, criteria and indicator to be used in the siting evaluation process. At this stage in the process, acceptable distances from “receptors”, “distance of travel along roads used by local traffic, etc.” will be determined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
<p>Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects</p> <p>Municipality of Clarington</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-2, Table 4-1, Social/Cultural Considerations – Land use conflicts will be a primary consideration in the identification of potential sites. To avoid double-counting, the discussion of land use conflicts for the evaluation of Alternative Technologies should be at a more general level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation of “Land use conflicts” will be important during the “Alternatives To” and “Alternative Methods” evaluation processes. The type of technology selected to form the preferred system, could in itself cause landuse conflicts depending on the siting requirements of the facility. For instance, there could be fewer landuse conflicts from a thermal facility located in an existing heavy industrial area, than from a biological facility which may be more suitably located in a less industrial area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects Municipality of Clarington <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, p. 5-6, Area Screening – The potentially suitable land use types should also be ranked. Ranking within the land use types should also be considered – e.g. a location within a prestige industrial area would create more conflict than within a general industrial area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The type of comparative evaluation between sites described in this comment and the assigning of advantages and disadvantages to particular sites will take place during Step 7 of the proposed siting process (evaluation of the short-list of sites). This particular criteria would be addressed as part of the evaluation of social/cultural environments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Janice Szwarcz, Senior Planner, Special Projects Municipality of Clarington <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, p.10, Potential Site Identification – Identification of the best site should be the first priority, ownership should not be an initial screening criteria. There may be a limited supply of suitable land in public ownership, and reliance on willing sellers may result in a number of suitable sites being overlooked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the site identification methodology outlined in sections 4.2 and 6.2 of the EA Terms of Reference, property ownership is being used to classify the types of sites, available. The EA Terms of Reference provides the methodology to find the best site available, if these sites are not available through public ownership or the willing seller approach, Steps 4b and 4c in Section 6.2 outline steps to identify alternative sites as suggested in this comment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, p.3, Table, in Natural Environment row, it should include water quality as an “Aspect Addressed”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.0 in Background Document 2-4 will be updated to include “Water Quality” as an “Aspect Addressed”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Section 2.0 in Background Document 2-4 has been updated to include “Water Quality” as an “Aspect Addressed”.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Karen Whitney, Principal Planner, York Planning Department York Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3, Natural Environment – The use of mapping to outline the natural features of the area would be more helpful than just written description. E.g. mapping of Oak Ridges Moraine and its Key Natural Heritage Features and Hydrologically Sensitive Features, Streams, Rivers and Lakes, the physiographic regions with the ANSIs, ESAs, PSWs, significant forest resources, the Regional Greenlands system and the Greenbelt Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed mapping, including those items suggested, of the study area will be developed during the evaluation of Alternative Methods. This comment will be addressed during the EA Study process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3 - Feeding into background document 2-5, it should be noted that York Region undertook the ORM conformity exercise and adopted Regional Official Plan 41, which was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs on Oct. 21, 2004. ROPA 41 in conjunction with the ORM Conservation Plan provide the policy framework to evaluate potential waste management alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Durham and York staff recognize the referenced documents and will consider the impact of the policies within these documents as well as other relevant planning documents, during the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Karen Whitney, Principal Planner, York Planning Department York Region <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4 - The third paragraph, with regard to urban areas, should include “York Region has adopted policies that promote intensification as a priority in a series of centres and corridors supported by rapid transit”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4 - will be updated to include the suggested statement “York Region has adopted policies that promote intensification as a priority in a series of centres and corridors supported by rapid transit”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4 - has been updated to include the suggested statement “York Region has adopted policies that promote intensification as a priority in a series of centres and corridors supported by rapid transit”.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4 – Land use maps from both the Durham and York Region’s Official Plans would be helpful additions to this section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although important, this level of detail is not usually included at the EA Terms of Reference stage. This comment will be considered and addressed during the EA study at the evaluation of Alternative Methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Karen Whitney, Principal Planner, York Planning Department York Region <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4 - The section on industrial development patterns should include reference to the employments areas next to Hwy 400 and 427. Information re. the employment area can be found in a report entitled “York Region Vacant Employment Land Inventory”, dated Sept. 7, 2005. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although important, this level of detail is not usually included at the EA Terms of Reference stage. This comment will be considered and addressed during the EA study at the evaluation of Alternative Methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.4, First Nation Communities – Indicates that the Chippewas of Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nations are located in York Region. The Rama reserve is not in York Region; rather it is located in the Township of Ramara within the County of Simcoe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reference to the Chippewas of Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nations in Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.4, will be changed identify them as outside the study area the County of Simcoe. Through preliminary consultation with the Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA) and the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), this First Nation group will remain part of the Government Review Team and will be consulted throughout the EA Study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The reference to the Chippewas of Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nations in Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.4, has been changed identify them as outside the study area in the County of Simcoe.</i>



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Karen Whitney, Principal Planner, York Planning Department York Region <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.7, Major Recreational Features – Could be more informative by including some mapping and more details. Specifics could include some of the major Conservation Areas, such as Boyd Conservation Area, Kortwright Centre for Conservation, Sibbald Point Provincial Park, Canada’s Wonderland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although important, this level of detail is not usually included at the EA Terms of Reference stage. This comment will be considered and addressed during the EA study at the evaluation of Alternative Methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6.1 – Does not mention Hwy 427, which extends into Vaughan and accesses a significant amount of employment land. Planning is underway to develop these lands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.5 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6.1. will be updated to include a reference to Highway 427 extending into York Region through the City of Vaughan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Section 5.5 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6.1. have been updated to include a reference to Highway 427 extending into York Region and terminating at Highway 7.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6 – Construction has been completed for the new ramps at 16th Avenue and 404. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6 will be updated to reflect the comment provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6 has been updated to reflect the comment provided.</i>



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Karen Whitney, Principal Planner, York Planning Department York Region <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.6 - Mapping of the existing and proposed transportation networks and utility corridors would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although important, this level of detail is not usually included at the EA Terms of Reference stage. This comment will be considered and addressed during the EA study at the evaluation of Alternative Methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5, <i>The Planning Act</i> - Clarify that “the Province has delegated land use planning authority to the Regions and area municipalities”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5 will be clarified as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5 has been clarified as suggested.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5, <i>The Planning Act</i> - Replace “construction permitting” with “subdivision of land”. Construction permitting may be interpreted to fall under the Building Code Act rather than the Planning Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5 will be updated as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5 has been updated as suggested.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Karen Whitney, Principal Planner, York Planning Department York Region <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5, <i>The Planning Act</i> – It should be noted that “The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing may declare a provincial interest and request an amendment to an Official Plan despite the delegation of authority to the municipalities”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5 will be updated as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 3.5 has been updated as suggested.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1, <i>Applicable Municipal Approval Requirements</i> – Include “York Region’s Official Plan requires an amendment for any new solid waste disposal facility”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 will be updated as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 has been updated as suggested.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1, <i>Applicable Municipal Approval Requirements</i> – An amendment to the Official Plan will also be required to establish a facility that will meet the needs of other communities outside of York Region, as Policy 6.8.4 states “That any new solid waste facility be designed and operated to meet the waste disposal needs of the Region of York only”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 will be updated as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 has been updated as suggested.</i>



TABLE 3 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Karen Whitney, Principal Planner, York Planning Department York Region <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1, <i>Applicable Municipal Approval Requirements</i> – York Region’s Official Plan includes policies prohibiting solid waste facilities in the Greenlands System, Environmental Policy Areas, and Agricultural Policy Areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 will be updated as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 has been updated as suggested.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1, <i>Applicable Municipal Approval Requirements</i> – York Region’s Official Plan prohibits development of a waste disposal site within a headwater area or an area of permeable soils where there is a risk of contamination of subsurface waters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 will be updated as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>The text in Background Document 2-5, Section 4.1 has been updated as suggested.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-5, Section 4.2 – Note that York Region is the approval authority for local Official Plan Amendments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-5, Section 4.2 will be updated to reflect that York Region is the approval authority for local Official Plan Amendments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Background Document 2-5, Section 4.2 has been updated to reflect that York Region is the approval authority for local Official Plan Amendments.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District <i>Ministry of Natural Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ToR Table 4-1 “Study Components – ‘Alternatives To’”, it would be beneficial to the reader if examples could be provided for each of the Components. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of each category of technologies will be provided in Table 4-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Examples of each category of technologies have been provided in Table 4-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ToR Section 5 “Description of Environment Potentially Affected”, a section needs to be added that addresses the protection of mineral aggregate resources and operations in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Furthermore, mineral aggregate resources should be identified as part of this EA, as a potential resources that may be needed for some of the alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exclusionary criteria to be applied in Step 2 of the proposed siting methodology will be utilized to eliminate areas that would be considered unsuitable for the purposes of siting a waste processing facility. The types of “constraints” related to mineral aggregate resources will be addressed as part Step 7 in the siting process where the short list of sites are comparatively evaluated under the category of “Technical Considerations” and any on site constraints are identified, including mineral aggregate resources and operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.4 has been added to include specific references to aggregate, oil and gas resources.</i>



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District <i>Ministry of Natural Resources</i> (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are several oil and gas wells within the York and Durham regions, and these locations need to be considered when siting any facility. Locations of these operations can be found at: www.ogsrlibrary.com/well_locations.html 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exclusionary criteria to be applied in Step 2 of the proposed siting methodology will be utilized to eliminate areas that would be considered unsuitable for the purposes of siting a waste processing facility. The types of “constraints” related to oil and gas wells will be addressed as part Step 7 in the siting process where the short list of sites are comparatively evaluated under the category of “Technical Considerations” and any on site constraints are identified, including oil and gas wells. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.4 has been added to include specific references to aggregate, oil and gas resources.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ToR Section 5.1 “Natural Environment”, the Iroquois Shoreline and major river valleys should also be included as major landform features. In general, more detail should be included in the description of natural features, including the area’s types of natural heritage features such as woodlands, wetlands, and watercourses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reference to the existence of the Iroquois shoreline will be added to Section 5.1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.1 with recognition of it being a significant headwater area for some watercourses. A more detailed description of the natural heritage features within Durham and York will be prepared as part of the EA Study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A reference to the existence of the Iroquois shoreline has been added to Section 5.1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.1 with recognition of it being a significant headwater area for some watercourses.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ToR Section 6.3 “Application for a Competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) Process”: How does the EA proceed if a site is chosen outside of the York/Durham boundaries? This would now involve members of the general public who had not previously participated in the EA, because they were unaware that their municipality was a siting option. How do they provide input into the Terms of Reference on an EA that until then, would not involve them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As outlined in Section 2.7 of Background Document 2-3, in order for a site, located outside Durham/York, to be considered at this stage in the process it must have at least an approved EA Terms of Reference which includes the acceptance of Durham and York Regions for processing. As a result, in order to receive approval of the EA Terms of Reference, this facility, would have already undergone a public and agency consultation process which identified Durham and York and potential sources of waste. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If any sites are chosen outside of the GTA, another office of MNR will likely be involved in any site specific review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As outlined in Section 2.7 of Background Document 2-3, in order for a site, located outside Durham/York, to be considered at this stage in the process it must have at least an approved EA Terms of Reference which includes the acceptance of Durham and York Regions for processing. As a result, in order to receive approval of the EA Terms of Reference, this facility, would have already undergone a public and agency consultation process which identified Durham and York and potential sources of waste. It is assumed that in order to receive approval from the Minister of the Environment, the respective MNR office would have already been consulted on this issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ToR Section 9 “Flexibility in Application of the Terms of Reference”: If the ToR is to be flexible, how does one know whether the EA is following the ToR? The details are in the Background Documents (it is difficult to completely understand the ToR without reading the BDs), but are not subject to Ministry approval. Who, therefore, ensures that the details in the BDs are being followed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Durham York Residual Waste Disposal Planning Study is being carried out under the existing Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) and related guidelines. In Ontario undertakings such as those being considered in this Study require approval under the EAA. Section 9 provides flexibility in order to accommodate “minor adjustments”. Any changes to the EA Terms of Reference would be completed in consultation with the Public, Agencies and the MOE before proceeding. Approval of the ultimate EA study will in part depend on the proponents ensuring that the study was completed in accordance with EA Terms of Reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear in the ToR whether any field work will be undertaken, or if it is the intent that data will be collected for existing sources only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to undertake the detailed evaluation process outlined in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 of the EA Terms of Reference, the necessary data will be required. To the degree possible, this data will be collected from existing sources, however, should the necessary data not exist to complete the evaluation, the need to identify additional data sources or collect first order data will be considered at that time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District <i>Ministry of Natural Resources</i> (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear as to the approximate number of sites that will be included in the Long List and Short List. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of sites that will be included in the Long list and Short list has not been defined in order to not restrict or inhibit the identification of a suitable range of sites that may offer unique advantages and disadvantages for the siting of a long-term facility(ies). However, based on the detailed analysis that will be required to be completed at the short list of sites and the potential costs associated with collecting first order data on numerous sites, it is likely that the short list will contain less than 5 sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-2, Section 2 “Overview of Potential Alternative Disposal Approaches and Technologies”, the examples of proposed alternatives should be included in the ToR document itself. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of each category of technologies will be provided in Table 4-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Examples of each category of technologies have been provided in Table 4-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Figure 2-1 “Overview of Proposed Facility Siting Process”, the public consultation arrow starts at Step 2, but it should start at Step 1: “Finalize Siting Methodology and Criteria and Confirm Priority Rankings”. The public should be involved in providing input into both the criteria and how they are ranked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 2-1 has been revised to identify specific points of consultation in the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”. As suggested, the public will be involved in providing input into both the criteria and how they are prioritized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Figure 2-1 of Background Document 2-3 has been revised to identify specific points in the evaluation of “Alternative Methods” where the public will be consulted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Section 2.2, Step 2 “Area Screening”, the third bullet list should be expanded to include significant wildlife habitat, species at risk, and fish habitat. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix F, Table f-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-3, Section 2.2, Step 2 “Area Screening” will be updated to include species at risk in the third bullet. Impacts to wildlife habitat and fish habitat will be considered at the comparative evaluation stage in the siting process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix F, Table f-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Document 2-3, Section 2.2, Step 2 “Area Screening” will be updated to include species at risk in the third bullet.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Section 2.2, Step 2 “Area Screening”, within the Oak Ridges Moraine and the Greenbelt Plan area, Key Natural Heritage Features and their associated vegetative protection zones should be listed in accordance with these two plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the intent of the area screening process that all Key Natural Heritage Features would be screened out automatically when the Greenbelt Plan area and Oak Ridges Moraine are screened from further consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Section 2.2, Step 2 “Area Screening”, an additional bullet point should be added for mineral aggregate deposits that are of primary and secondary significance. If the site is to be located outside of York and Durham, selected bedrock resources should also be added to the list. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exclusionary criteria to be applied in Step 2 of the proposed siting methodology will be utilized to eliminate areas that would be considered unsuitable for the purposes of siting a waste processing facility. The types of “constraints” related to mineral aggregate resources will be addressed as part Step 7 in the siting process where the short list of sites are comparatively evaluated under the category of “Technical Considerations” and any on site constraints are identified, including mineral aggregate resources and operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Background Document 2-4, Section 2.4.4 has been added to include specific references to aggregate, oil and gas resources.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Table 2-1 Step 2 “Area Screening” the first criteria “Exclude designated lands located within areas protected by Provincial/Federal legislation” needs to include Provincial Parks with an appropriate separation distance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial Parks are considered lands protected by Provincial legislation and therefore would be screened from further consideration in this step of the evaluation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Table 2-1 Step 2 “Area Screening” the criterion that includes designated Natural Heritage Features and Areas should also include: significant wildlife habitat, species at risk, fish habitat, and key natural heritage features as identified in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the intent of the area screening process that all Key Natural Heritage Features would be screened out automatically when the Greenbelt Plan area and Oak Ridges Moraine are screened from further consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Section 2.6 Step 6 “Identification of the Preferred Municipal Site”, for the evaluation for Short List sites, the first step should be expanded to include evaluation of a site using the ecological land classification system, as well as appropriate field work (including a three-season survey) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the Screening and Evaluation process identified in Step 2 prior to Step 6 it is unlikely that the completion of this type of evaluation will be necessary as the facility will likely be sited in an existing Heavy industrial area. However, should at the short list of sites, this concern become evident through additional consultation with the MNR, the appropriate field work will be completed, which may include a three-season survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District <i>Ministry of Natural Resources</i> (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 6 “Identification of the Preferred Municipal Site”, under the “Environmentally Sensitive Areas and Species Impacts” criteria, the word ‘vulnerable’ in the indicator column should be replaced with the words ‘special concern’, as this would reflect the current technology being used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment. This change will be made in Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 6 has been revised to reflect the recommended title change from “vulnerable” to “special concern”.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 6 “Identification of the Preferred Municipal Site”, the list of Natural Heritage Features and Areas should include significant wildlife habitat and fish habitat. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 7 will be updated to include significant wildlife habitat and fish habitat as indicators in the evaluation of Natural Heritage Features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 7 will be updated to include significant wildlife habitat and fish habitat as indicators in the evaluation of Natural Heritage Features.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2.3, the stated number of wetlands and wetland complexes should be removed, as this number will likely change over time. Furthermore, the following should be modified for the wetlands portion of the section: Replace “aggregate” with “total” Replace the number “250” with “200” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This change will be made in Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. The following changes have been made to Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stated number of wetlands and wetland complexes has been removed; “aggregate” has been replaced with “total”; and, The number “250” has been replaced with “200”.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2.4, the title “Species of Special Conservation Concern” should be changed to “Species at Risk”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This change will be made in Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2. has been revised to reflect the recommended title change from “Species of Special Conservation Concern” to “Species at Risk”.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2.4, the reference to reptiles should be expanded to include the wood turtle and the spotted turtle, both which have been found in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2., will be expanded to include the wood turtle and the spotted turtle when referencing reptiles within the study area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2, has been expanded to include the wood turtle and the spotted turtle when referencing reptiles within the study area.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2.4, the reference to the redbreasted dace should be as a threatened species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment. This change will be made in Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3.2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Background Document 2-4, Section 2.3., has been revised to include redbreasted dace as a threatened species.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District <i>Ministry of Natural Resources</i> (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, a section should be added, similar to 2.3.2.3 that provides direction on how to manage the site selection process for significant wildlife habitat and fish habitat. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-4 is not intended to provide a description of the site selection process. Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 7 will be updated to include significant wildlife habitat and fish habitat as indicators in the evaluation of Natural Heritage Features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>Background Document 2-3, Table 2-3 Step 7 will be updated to include significant wildlife habitat and fish habitat as indicators in the evaluation of Natural Heritage Features.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A section should be added in Background Document 2-4 that addresses mineral aggregate deposits and operations, both how they will be protected from incompatible uses and their potential use as a resource for the preferred alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A paragraph in Section 2.4.4. of Background Document 2-4 will be added to address mineral aggregate deposits and operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>A paragraph in Section 2.4.4 of Background Document 2-4 has been added to address mineral aggregate deposits and operations.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Background Document 2-4, a section should be added that addresses the presence of oil or gas hazards and petroleum resource operations that may occur within or in proximity to the short list of sites, and how they would be addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A paragraph in Section 2.4.4 of Background Document 2-4 will be added to address oil or gas hazards and petroleum resource operations. As part of this siting evaluation process, oil and gas wells that could be impacted by the siting of the preferred facility would be considered and addressed at that time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>A paragraph in Section 2.4.4 of Background Document 2-4 has been added to address oil or gas hazards and petroleum resource operations.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-5, the <i>Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act</i> and the <i>Public Lands Act</i> are additional pieces of legislation that should be added to this document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-5 provides a select list of key legislation to be considered, however, additional legislation including the <i>Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act</i> and the <i>Public Lands Act</i> will be considered as applicable throughout the EA Study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Theresa Fanci, District Planner, Aurora District Ministry of Natural Resources <i>(cont'd)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-5, when choosing the preferred method and site, the Watershed and Subwatershed plans, fishery management plans, and species recovery strategies/plans should be taken into consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once the proponent is in the appropriate stage of the siting process, the MNR will be contacted to ensure we have the most current documentation, including the plans identified, for consideration in the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Beth Williston, Watershed Planning and Policy Specialist, EA Review, Planning and Development Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments related to the draft terms of reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend that Section 3.0 of Background Document 2-5: Relevant Policies and Approvals Requirements be updated to include the Conservation Authorities Act with specific language provided by the TRCA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Document 2-5, Section 3.0 will be updated to include a reference to the Conservation Authorities Act which includes the text provided by the TRCA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. Background Document 2-5, Section 3.0 will be updated to include a reference to the Conservation Authorities Act which includes the text provided by the TRCA.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Mike Stone, District Planner-Guelph (Via Telephone Follow-up) Ministry of Natural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time, comments will be provided from the Aurora branch. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Derryk Renton, Team Leader, Land Use Coordination (Via Telephone Follow-up) Ministry of Natural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time, comments will be provided from the district level (i.e. Aurora branch). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Katie Griffiths, District Planner-Peterborough (Via Telephone Follow-up) Ministry of Natural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time, comments will come from the Aurora branch. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Martin Hicks, Director, Universities Branch, (Via Telephone Follow-up) Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Kevin Bentley, Manager, Engineering Office – Southwestern Ontario Region (Via Telephone Follow-up) Ministry of Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 3 (cont'd)
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
 Response to Government Review Team (GRT) Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the EA Terms of Reference
Ken Williams, Manager, Engineering Office-Eastern Ontario Region (Via Telephone Follow-up) <i>Ministry of Transportation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Jessica Peake, Land Use Planner (Via Telephone Follow-up) <i>York Region District School Board</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.
Dave Snelgrove, Superintendent of Plant Services (Via Telephone Follow-up) <i>York Region District School Board</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.