

**TABLE 7**  
**RESPONSE TO OCTOBER 2005 PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION ATTENDANT COMMENTS**  
**ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>Stakeholder/Agency</b>	<b>Comment Received</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference</b>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public information sessions &amp; workshops should be held in all municipalities of Durham.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the initiation of the development of the Draft EA Terms of Reference, public information sessions were held in each of the area municipalities of Durham Region.</li> <li>It was found that these events were poorly attended and that due to the large costs to hold these events, fewer events would be held in the future in central locations throughout Durham.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i> <i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diversion rates of 50% and 60% are far too low if York and Durham raise their diversion rate goals significantly it will help the environment and reduce size, capital and operating costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft EA Terms of Reference assumed a 60% waste diversion target based on the current Provincial Government policy initiative.</li> <li>• 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 2045.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Waste quantity projections in Background Document 2-1 have been updated in all documentation to reflect that waste diversion will increase to 75% by the end of the 35-year planning period.</i></li> <li>• <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></li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i> <i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If municipalities reduced the number of garbage bags per household per week, would this not encourage householders to compost and recycle more?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for your input. This suggestion will be considered by the Region of Durham and York Region in identifying the means to reach 60% waste diversion by 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i>  <i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 7. Section 2.2 – The full implications of this section are unclear for the taxpayers. If there is private sector ownership or participation in the “chosen alternative” that private sector will want to recover the costs plus a profit at the expense of the taxpayers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At this stage in the process, the proponents have not determined the ownership arrangements for any long-term processing facility(ies).</li> <li>Once the study has progressed to a stage where this decision needs to be made the advantages and disadvantages of each ownership option will be fully explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i>  <i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is there not more information on “zero waste” systems? Where are the highest rates of waste reduction in North America? How did these communities achieve this?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zero waste and the potential for additional at-source diversion will be investigated further at the outset of the consideration of “Alternatives to”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**  
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
 Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 9. The selection of the preferred alternative and the selection of the preferred landfill site must occur at the same time no matter where located. Please clarify the landfill issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why are the “alternatives” restricted to mechanical, biological and thermal? Is the plasma arc reactor to be considered as one of these “alternatives”? What alternatives have been omitted? Explain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been two (2) broad alternatives that have not been considered in this EA Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Chemical Processing – this alternative has been screened out as this is not a proven technology, and a lack of evidence of how this material could process Municipal Solid Waste.</li> <li>• Landfill alone – this alternative is not being considered as it does not meet the proposed purpose of the undertaking which is to to “...recover resources – both materials and energy - ...”.</li> <li>• Plasma Arc Reaction is one technology that would be considered under the broad category of Thermal Treatment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a needed and a very expensive process. The capital cost will be very large. The general public must be given many opportunities, before decisions are made, to be meaningfully involved. The EA must be very specific on this. Please amend it now to be specific.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the EA study proceeds, the type of consultation and locations to be utilized will be determined based on interest in the study and the potential for consultation with impacted parties as outlined in Table 7-1 of the EA Terms of Reference.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who will choose the Monitoring Strategy? How? Will the general Public be involved? How and by whom will they be selected? When? Where? Please explain. This is a very important aspect.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The detailed monitoring strategy will be developed during the EA study once the preferred Technology and Site have been determined.</li> <li>The details of who will be monitoring the facility and site, and how the public will be involved in this process will be determined at that time.</li> <li>Ultimately monitoring requirements will be specified by MOE in the conditions of approval for the facility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not like to be restricted to “show and tell” information sessions. I prefer meetings where the public can give input and ask questions. These can be very helpful to both appointed and elected officials before decisions are made. “Decide and Defend” meetings are not productive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you for your comment, no response required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At what point will there be a full public discussion about who will own and operate the selected alternative? What are the advantages and disadvantages of either public or private ownership?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At this stage in the process, the proponents have not determined the ownership arrangements for any long-term processing facility(ies).</li> <li>Once the study has progressed to a stage where this decision needs to be made the advantages and disadvantages of each ownership option will be fully explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I could not find any reference to intervener funding. To level the playing field and to get as much broad advice as possible before decisions are made, the EA must make provision for adequate intervener funding. Better to spend before rather than after.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that an important aspect of environmental assessment and meaningful consultation is insurance that parties potentially impacted by an undertaking have the resources to participate in the process. It should be noted however that participant or intervenor funding is not a requirement of the EAA and need not be included as a component of the EA Terms of Reference.</li> <li>The Regions' are in the process of preparing a discussion paper on the development of a facility impact management strategy which will consider the provision of funding and/or compensation to those parties potentially impacted by any future waste management facility. This strategy is to be developed in consultation with the public at the outset of the EA study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will there have to be another EA to select the preferred landfill site for “process residue” from the selected alternative? Or is it planned that a municipality outside of Durham or York will accept the “process residue” in its landfill?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who will choose the public liaison or advisory committees? How will they be chosen? What will be the composition of these committees? General Public? Regional Staff? Elected Officials? Others? Be specific in the EA Draft.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The details for the consultation process broadly set out in Section 7.1 of the EA Terms of Reference regarding the parties to be consulted will be confirmed at the outset of each major step in the EA process. These details will be developed and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>At the time of distribution of the Draft EA Terms of Reference, Appendix C was not yet available. Appendix C has been incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference.</i></li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**  
Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
		<p>presented to agencies and the public for review and comment prior to initiation of evaluation activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The need for development of Public Liaison or Advisory Committees, and the process used to form such committees will be determined at that time.</li><li>• Please refer to Appendix C, Schedule “A” of the EA Terms of Reference which provides the Terms of Reference for the Joint Waste Management Group (JWMG). This Terms of Reference includes a description of the composition of the JWMG and the rationale for have 6 non-voting members of the public.</li></ul>	



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**  
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
 Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At what times during the entire EA and selection process will the general public be involved, consulted and heard?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The details for the consultation process broadly set out in Section 7.1 of the EA Terms of Reference will be confirmed at the outset of each major step in the EA process. These details will be developed and presented to agencies and the public for review and comment prior to initiation evaluation activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the estimated capital cost of this entire project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The estimated Capital Cost will be developed for each of the potential waste disposal systems during the evaluation of the “Alternatives To”.</li> <li>This information will be made available to the public during consultation on the “Alternatives to”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i> <i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The informal process is good, allowing people to spend as little or as much time as they wish. The Draft EA Terms of Reference are comprehensive, but also complicated. A smaller (2-4 pages) pamphlet would encourage more people to read it and could easily cover the essential elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you for your comment. As part of the EA Study, the proponents will be investigating new and innovative ways of presenting information to the public including the use of small executive summary or pamphlet materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i> <i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The emphasis on finding a method and a site reduces the possibility of a multi-method, multi-site solution – this might reduce transportation costs and issues and be more flexible if new and better technologies emerge in the future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in Section 4.1.1 of the EA Terms of Reference, processing systems will be evaluated rather than independent component approaches and technologies.</li> <li>In regards to siting, as noted in Section 4.2 of the EA Terms of Reference that multiple sites may be determined as the appropriate means of implementing the preferred residual processing system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i> <i>Town of Ajax</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perhaps information (concise, simply worded) could be sent out with the garbage pick up schedules.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you for your comment, no response required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>My initial impression is that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In preparing the proposed EA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In order to reduce the overall</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<p>there are too many loopholes in the process and too many places where the process can be stalled. The time frame for some kinds of projects seems too long, while other projects that may have similar or greater impacts can be fast-tracked. An example: fast-tracked housing developments on virgin farmland, while critical projects in waste management take years to process.</p>	<p>Terms of Reference the timing of the process set out in the draft EA Terms of Reference was critically reviewed and efforts were made to shorten the overall timeframe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>At the start of both the evaluation of "Alternatives to" and "Alternative Methods" the</li> </ul>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The principle of environmental assessment is excellent and one that I wholeheartedly support. Where the process could be improved, as my first impression, is in the area of accountability and responsibility. Where are the safeguards in the planning process for inevitable problems that will be encountered? Why should we be faced with waste management companies going bankrupt rather than acting responsibly and proactively when dealing with problems? These kinds of problems can be anticipated and appropriate methods of insuring and preparing for them should be part of the EA process.</li> </ul>	<p>public and agencies will be consulted regarding other potential refinements to streamline the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Province has been examining methods of improving the EA process, and if any changes come into affect during this Study they will be addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

<b>Stakeholder/Agency</b>	<b>Comment Received</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference</b>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There could be some prescriptive measures in place for the development project, whether it is for housing, light industry or waste management. The EA process is detailed and wide-ranging. Prescriptive measures could be drawn from the EA process and applied to the project during the planning and implementation phases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Province has been examining methods of improving the EA process, and if any changes come into affect during this Study they will be addressed.</li> <li>• The application of the EAA to other areas of municipal operations (housing, land-use planning) is outside the scope of the Durham/York Study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a local resident I very much appreciate the professional, comprehensive approach the Region has undertaken. Recognizing that thoroughness in the process is paramount, I would be very pleased if it were possible to shorten the implementation timeframe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public consultation is important and interesting. I have personally benefited from public consultation and information sessions, which I have attended in York and Durham Regions, on subjects including West Nile virus, water and wastewater management, and solid waste management. In each case I was impressed by the relevance and quantity of the material presented and the professional quality of the presenters, and in each case was puzzled by the lack of participation by the members of the public. If only people knew how valuable and informative these public consultation sessions can be. They would understand the issues in a much deeper and even more objective way that they could if they relied on the popular news media. They would have had an opportunity to provide input.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you for your comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**  
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
 Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do people know about the public consultation and information sessions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notification of these public consultation events has been issued through placement of notices in local weekly newspapers that serve both Durham and York Region.</li> <li>In addition to the placement of notices in local weekly newspapers, a Public Service Announcement (PSA) was issued to notify interested parties and organizations throughout Durham and York Regions.</li> <li>A Study website has been developed where notices of events, study documentation, etc. are posted <a href="http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca">www.durhamyorkwaste.ca</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**  
 Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
 Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The poster sessions on the EA process for establishing a residual waste processing facility provided information in a very clear format and the presenters from York and Durham regions and MacViro Consultants explained the process in a knowledgeable and interesting manner. The professionalism of these sessions creates a feeling that the right people are in place, and that the work to be done will be done well. My overall feeling after attending these sessions is that Durham and York Regions are being managed well, that there is sufficient transparency and accountability at play, and that we as a public can feel confident in our public sector.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you for your comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>



**TABLE 7 (cont'd)**

Consultation on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference  
Response to October 2005 Public Information Session Attendant Comments

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where are they finding out about the sessions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notification of these public consultation events has been issued through placement of notices in local weekly newspapers that serve both Durham and York Region.</li> <li>In addition to the placement of notices in local weekly newspapers, a Public Service Announcement (PSA) was issued to notify interested parties and organizations throughout Durham and York Regions.</li> <li>A Study website has been developed where notices of events, study documentation, etc. are posted <a href="http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca">www.durhamyorkwaste.ca</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do people read and understand the notices of meetings, workshops, and poster sessions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The advertising and communications strategy utilized in developing the EA Terms of Reference follows the typically methodology for undertaking these types of projects.</li> <li>As part of the EA Study, the proponents will be investigating new and innovative ways of presenting information to the public including the use of small executive summary or pamphlet materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do people care about these issues to the extent that they take a personal interest in learning about them?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of the EA Study, the proponents will be investigating new and innovative ways of reaching the public and encouraging participation in the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What motivates people to come to the public consultation and information sessions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of the EA Study, the proponents will be investigating new and innovative ways of reaching the public and encouraging participation in the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Cannington</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are people satisfied with the way things are? Complacent? Apathetic? Cynical? – What are the prevailing attitudes of the public? (How can they be assessed accurately and in a timely manner?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the EA Study, the proponents will be investigating new and innovative ways of reaching the public and encouraging participation in the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Pickering</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garbage collection should be centralized. Huge Dumps are: 1) A terrible eye sore, 2) A very messy operation, 3) Obviously a NIMBY problem, and 4) Poisons water ways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for your comment.</li> <li>• These comments are acknowledged in this table, but were not summarized in the Consultation Summary Report “<i>Summary Report and Record of Public Information Sessions on the Draft Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference</i>” dated November 2005, as they were received November 28, 2005.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder/Agency	Comment Received	Response	How it was Incorporated into the Proposed EA Terms of Reference
<p><i>Member of Public</i></p> <p><i>Pickering</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Region should be divided into “Bite Size” areas the same approximate size as those serviced by a single fire station. Each area should then be equipped with the following: 1) A state of the art incinerator, 2) enough trucks, 3) staff to collect the waste and operate the facility, 4) heat/electricity produced should be sold to the area people, 5) large manufacturing plants should have their own incinerator.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thank you for your comment.</li> <li>These comments are acknowledged in this table, but were not summarized in the Consultation Summary Report “<i>Summary Report and Record of Public Information Sessions on the Draft Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference</i>” dated November 2005, as they were received November 28, 2005.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the content of the Draft EA Terms of Reference (September 2005) required.</li> </ul>