

TABLE 5
RESPONSE TO NON-GOVERNMENT REVIEW TEAM (GRT) AGENCIES AND STAKEHOLDERS COMMENTS
ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) TERMS OF REFERENCE

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham/York Residual Waste Study – Joint Waste Management Group (JWVG)</i></p> <p>As recorded by: Beatrice Karczmarzyk, Project Consultant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was raised that the diversion target of 60% over the proposed 35 year planning period was too low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft EA Terms of Reference assumed a 60% waste diversion target based on the current Provincial Government policy initiative. Due to the length of the planning period, the projections in the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Documentation will be updated to consider the achievement of 60% waste diversion by 2011 and 75% waste diversion by 2031. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Waste quantity projections in Background Document 2-1 have been updated to reflect that waste diversion could increase to 75% by the end of the 35-year planning period.</i> <i>This target has been increased based on the assumption that society may generate less waste and a greater range of materials will be able to be captured and recycled in the more distant future.</i>



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p>Durham/York Residual Waste Study – Joint Waste Management Group (JWVG)</p> <p>As recorded by: Beatrice Karczmarzyk, Project Consultant</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was raised with the overall length of the study schedule, and how best the process could be expedited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to reduce the overall schedule time required to complete the EA process and develop a facility, the process for the evaluation of ‘Alternative Methods’ will be amended so that the competitive RFP process to select the preferred vendor/developer of a facility(ies) to provide the preferred “Alternative to” is conducted in parallel with the evaluation of the short-list of facility sites. This change will be reflected in Section 6.2 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and in Background Document 2-3, Section 2.7. At the start of both the evaluation of “Alternatives to” and “Alternative Methods” the public and agencies will be consulted regarding other potential refinements to streamline the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to reduce the overall schedule time required to complete the EA process and develop a facility, the process for the evaluation of ‘Alternative Methods’ has been amended so that the competitive RFP process to select the preferred vendor/developer of a facility(ies) to provide the preferred “Alternative to” is conducted in parallel with the evaluation of the short-list of facility sites. This change has been reflected in Section 6.2 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and in Background Document 2-3, Section 2.7.



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p>Bruce Lindsay, Chair</p> <p><i>Newmarket Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have reviewed the Draft EA Terms of Reference and have no comments at this time, but would like to continue to be consulted throughout the EA process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your consideration, we will continue to consult with your organization 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.
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Section 3.3 “Potential Consideration of Contingency or Surplus Disposal Capacity”, the last sentence of 1st paragraph should be deleted and focus placed on potential increase of waste diversion targets rather than limiting the target to 60%. Need to look beyond 60% diversion in order to encourage responsible citizenship. The wording in the Terms of Reference should strengthen the Region’s commitment to the 3Rs (reduce, reuse, recycle). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft EA Terms of Reference assumed a 60% waste diversion target based on the current Provincial Government policy initiative. Due to the length of the planning period, the projections in the Proposed EA Terms of Reference and Background Documentation will be updated to reflect the achievement of 60% waste diversion by 2011 and 75% waste diversion by 2031. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Waste quantity projections have been updated in all documentation to reflect that waste diversion may increase to 75% by the end of the 35-year planning period.</i> <i>This target has been increased based on the assumption that society may generate less waste and a greater range of materials will be able to be captured and recycled in the more distant future.</i>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Section 4.1.1 “Consideration of Disposal Systems”, the EA Terms of Reference must consider the ultimate disposal of the remaining post-process waste. Landfill alternatives, therefore, must be included in the scope of the EA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role of landfill for management of post-processing residual waste materials is discussed in Section 4.1.2 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference. As part of the evaluation of “Alternatives to” the projected quantities and composition of post-processing residual waste that will require landfill disposal will be considered and evaluated as part of the full life-cycle analysis. 	<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 Section 4.1.1, Table 4.1 “Alternatives to” should include hydrogas fuel technologies (i.e. gasification). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gasification is one type of technology that would be considered under the broad category of Thermal Treatment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required. <i>A “For Example” section has been added to Table 4.1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference that provides several examples of the types of technologies which would be considered under the headings of Mechanical, Biological and Thermal Treatment.</i>



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Section 5.1 “Natural Environment”, the Lake Iroquois shoreline should be mentioned. It is also a significant headwater area for some 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 with recognition of it being a significant headwater area for some watercourses. 	<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 with recognition of it being a significant headwater area for some watercourses.</i>
<p>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Section 6, the evaluation methodologies for “alternatives to” and “alternative methodologies” need to consider the time and duration of impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation of “Alternatives to” and “Alternative Methods” will consider the time and duration of potential impacts as part of the evaluation process. The method of applying the evaluation criteria as set out in Appendix E and F of the EA Terms of Reference will address the time and duration of potential natural environmental and social/cultural impacts where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Section 6, the impacts of transporting residual waste and the waste remaining after processing needs to be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation of “Alternatives to” and “Alternative Methods” will consider the potential impacts related to transporting residual waste as part of the evaluation process. The method of applying the evaluation criteria as set out in Appendix E and F of the EA Terms of Reference will address the potential impacts of transporting residual waste where relevant. 	<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 Appendix F Table F-1, groundwater discharge/recharge areas should be included under the 3rd bullet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table F-1 of the Proposed EA Terms of Reference will include a reference to <i>groundwater discharge/recharge 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 has been updated to include a reference to <u>groundwater discharge/recharge areas</u> as examples under the third bullet (Exclude designated Natural Heritage Features and Areas within an appropriate separation distance of these designations).</i>



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reference to Section 3.2, the amount of leftover material after processed via the preferred method must be considered in this EA. As it is understood, a significant portion of the processed waste will become a solid residue. Possible methods to manage this residue must be included and evaluated early on in the EA process in order to determine the preferred method for managing the remaining material. For example, there may be modification to the waste processing technology, such as the addition of reagents to the waste during combustion, that could improve the landfill properties of the ash/char) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirements to manage post-processing residue (leftover material after processing) will be addressed in the evaluation of “Alternatives to”. • The composition and amount of post-processing residue will vary depending on the technologies included in the systems that will be evaluated. • Certain post-processing residues, such as Class B compost or granular materials (including ash/char) could potentially be marketed and diverted from landfill disposal, however, the ability to do so is directly related to Ontario regulations that currently prohibit the marketing of these materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last statement in Section 3.2 "...no processes to eliminate the need for landfill capacity..." may be true, but there may be processes available to reduce the long-term impact of the solid residue landfilled or to allow for future recovery/reuse of the wastes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed, all of the technologies being considered have a landfill component, however several, such as Biological and Thermal processing have the ability to stabilize the organic residue so that the material to be landfilled is more inert than unprocessed Municipal Solid Waste (MSW). The ability to recover/reuse any post-processing residues in the future will be addressed in the evaluation of "Alternatives to". Certain post-processing residues, such as Class B compost or granular materials (including ash/char) could potentially be marketed and diverted from landfill disposal, however, the ability to do so is directly related to Ontario regulations that currently prohibit the marketing of these materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the scope described in Section 4 include the possibility of “mining” existing landfills to remove previously landfilled solid waste or other wastes such as tires or sludge stored in lagoons? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intent of this EA study is to secure processing capacity for waste that will be generated within the planning period and to minimize the amount of material requiring landfill disposal. The role of landfill for management of post-processing residual waste materials is discussed in Section 4.1.2 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference. As part of the evaluation of “Alternatives to” the projected quantities and composition of post-processing residual waste that will require landfill disposal will be considered and evaluated as part of the full life-cycle analysis. The potential to undertake landfill mining to remove previously landfilled solid waste in the future is outside of the scope of this EA study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of the EA should consider the disposal of industrial and agricultural wastes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As outlined in Section 3.3 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference, surplus disposal capacity available at the facility could be utilized to manage industrial, commercial and institutional waste (IC&I), which could include some forms of agricultural waste. 	<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"> Does the EA Terms of Reference permit the waste processing and ash/char disposal areas to be some distance apart? For example, if a waste gasifier is located in one community, can/will the ash/char disposal be located elsewhere? How would the impacts of inter-site transportation be assessed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is anticipated that a long-term processing facility will likely not be located on the same site as a long-term residue landfill disposal facility(ies). Typically, these types of facilities are located in different land use settings (Processing facilities in industrial areas, landfill sites in more rural areas). The impacts of inter-site transportation would be assessed in the evaluation of the Short-list of alternative sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Section 6, the evaluation process needs to consider the time or duration of impacts. While impacts such as noise and truck traffic will be temporary in nature, others such as air and groundwater pollution (and their mitigative measures) will last much longer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation of “Alternatives to” and “Alternative Methods” will consider the time and duration of potential impacts as part of the evaluation process. The method of applying the evaluation criteria as set out in Appendix E and F of the EA Terms of Reference will address the time and duration of potential natural environmental and social/cultural impacts where relevant. As outlined in Section 8.0 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference there is a commitment to develop and implement a monitoring strategy to ensure the performance of mitigative measures and identify/confirm potential long-term impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.



TABLE 5 (cont'd)

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference
Response to Non-Government Review Team (GRT) Agencies and Stakeholders Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Durham Environmental Advisory Committee</i></p> <p>As documented by: Lori Riviere, Planner, Region of Durham Representative</p> <p><i>(cont'd)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of the EA must also include consideration of impacts during the siting and construction of the proposed facilities, as well as on-going operations and eventual site decommissioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EA will consider the potential impacts during construction of the proposed facility(ies) as part of the comparative evaluation of sites and commits to develop and implement a monitoring strategy in Section 8.0 of the Draft EA Terms of Reference to ensure the performance of mitigative measures and identify/confirm potential long-term impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.